FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 013 *19 January 1983*

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

NATO Reaction to Gromyko Statements Reported AA 1
[Krasikov]
TASS: USSR Will Match Missile Buildup in Europe AA 2
[Serov]
Text of Zhukov Article on Soviet, Pact Proposals AA 2
[PRAVDA 15 Jan]
PRAVDA: U.S. Mobilizing Allies To Undermine Detente AA 6
[19 Jan]
PRAVDA Reports U.S. Confusion Over Disarmament AA 6
[15 Jan]
U.S. Legislators Denied Access to START Team AA 7
[Tolkunov in PRAVDA 15 Jan]
PRAVDA Discusses U.S. Stance at Geneva Talks AA 7
[18 Jan]
IZVESTIYA on Development, Use of U.S. SLMB's AA 9
[19 Jan]

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

PRAVDA Reviews Arms Issues, Middle East CC 1
[Bolshakov, 16 Jan]
IZVESTIYA on Role of New U.S. Central Command CC 5
[Sturua, 10 Jan]

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Soltan Warns Against U.S. Military Strategy A 1

CHINA

PRAVDA Reports on U.S.-PRC Textile Talks [15 Jan] B 1
Soviet Embassy Holds Reception in Beijing B 1
Chinese Officials Attend B 1
Soviet Singer Quoted B 1
[Ignatneva in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 6 Jan]

NORTHEAST ASIA

Reports, Comments on U.S. Visit by Japan's Nakasone C 1
TV Report C 1
Radio Commentary [Afonin] C 2
TASS on Talks, Problems C 3
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Views Japanese Military Effort C 3
[Vinogradov, 9 Jan]
Japan-USSR Trade, Economic Relations Discussed C 6
[Alekseyev]

WESTERN EUROPE

Gromyko, West Germans Conclude Official Talks G 1
Talks With Kohl, Other Activities G 1
18 Jan Press Conference G 2
Remarks on Arms Issues [DPA] G 3
Meets With SPD's Brandt G 4
Communist Party Leader Mies G 5
SPD Chancellor Candidate Vogel G 5
Final Talks Held G 6
Departs Bonn for GDR [DPA] G 6
Moscow Radio Assesses Visit [Sakharov] G 6
Dinner Speech Comparison G 7
TASS Cites Brandt on Andropov Peace Proposals G 8
British Pilot Tried for Shooting Down Plane G 8
Austrian Foreign Minister Calls for Disarmament G 8

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

USSR Delegation Reportedly To Visit Lebanon 19 Jan H 1
[Algiers]
CPSU Delegation Departs for Syria 14 Jan H 1
[PRAVDA 15 Jan]
TASS Notes UNIFIL Extension, Soviet Envoy Comment H 1
SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA Interviews Lebanese Premier H 1
Arab Media Welcome 'Arafat Moscow Talks H 2
[PRAVDA 15 Jan]
IZVESTIYA Notes An-Nasir Birth. USSR-Aided Projects H 3
[Agafonov, Mikheyev, 16 Jan]

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

RSA 'Puppet Administration' in Namibia Falls J 1
Nujoma: 'SWAPO Will Continue the Struggle' J 1
[IZVESTIYA 10 Jan]

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

PRAVDA Criticizes Press, Reveals Economic 'Turns' R 1
[TANJUG]
Romanov Speaks at Leningrad Commemoration R 1
Public Supports Tough Stance on Shirkers R 1
Procurator General Writes on Law and Order R 2
[Rekunkov in PRAVDA 9 Jan]
MVD Deputy Chief on Preventing Embezzlement R 5
[Zabotin in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 8 Jan]
National Differences, Official Policy Viewed R 8
Denial of Russification Charge R 8
[Akhmedyarov in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 5 Jan]

Solomentsev Interview R 11
[Zarechkin, Poroykov in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 29 Dec]
Algerian Writer R 13
[Stoppi in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 29 Dec]
IZVESTIYA Reviews Volume 9 of Brezhnev Book [19 Dec] R 13
SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA on Effect of Rumor, Gossip R 16
[Stepunina, 28 Dec]

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Economists View Sverdlovsk Oblast's Potential S 1
[Denisov in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 8 Jan]
PRAVDA Criticizes Ferrous Metallurgy Ministry [28 Dec] S 1
Briefs: Automatic Railway Stations S 1

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Eight Cosmos-Series Satellites Launched 19 Jan U 1
PRAVDA Publishes Article on Cosmos-1402 [16 Jan] U 1

NATO REACTION TO GROMYKO STATEMENTS REPORTED

LD182142 Moscow TASS in English 2123 GMT 18 Jan 83

["Is It 'To Separate' or 'To Count Together'? -- Confusion" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow January 18 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Anatoliy Krasikov writes:

FRANCE PRESSE has just reported from the headquarters of the North Atlantic alliance in Brussels that it views the latest statements of Soviet Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko as an attempt to separate the European NATO countries from the United States.

A strange reaction, because it is not the USSR but certain NATO countries, first and foremost the United States, that are trying to "separate" themselves from their own allies in counting missiles targeted at the countries of the socialist community. As if the United States were a member of the North Atlantic alliance while Britain and France, other two major Western powers, were pursuing a policy of neutrality.

As for the Soviet Union, it has always considered the United States and its West European allies as a single bloc. That is why in assessing the balance of forces between the North Atlantic alliance and the Warsaw Treaty Organizations in Europe account must be taken of the armaments of all the states participating in those groupings.

FRANCE PRESSE said in the same news dispatch from the NATO Headquarters, quoting "NATO circles," that Andrey Gromyko "threatened" the Western powers with the deployment of new Soviet missiles if U.S. Pershing-2s were deployed in West Germany in the autumn of 1983. What "threat" can there be if the Soviet Union does not want to have in the European zone not a single missile or plane more than the NATO countries have and if it is willing to have this commitment formalized in an appropriate document?

A symptomatic statement in this context has been made by Margaret Thatcher in the House of Commons on Tuesday night. It follows from it that the best decision would be the complete dismantling of Soviet missiles while the British missiles would be preserved absolutely intact.

One may think that the missiles and planes of the countries of the North Atlantic alliance aimed at the USSR and its allies, poised to deliver an atomic strike against us, are not a threat but a blessing for which the Warsaw Treaty Organization should thank Washington, London, Paris, Bonn and other "Atlantic capitals." As for the socialist countries' desire to have as many weapons, they are regarded as a "threat" and "blackmail."

We have always stated that the arms race is not our choice. As Andrey Gromyko said in Bonn, we would prefer to the arms race imposed on us an agreement on lessening the level of nuclear confrontation, and the more drastic the lessening the better. That is why we are doing everything possible to reach agreement, both on nuclear arms limitation in Europe and on strategic arms.

Instead of working honestly to achieve these goals, certain Western governments are staging a comedy, which may one day become a tragedy.

The USSR and other socialist countries do not want any "separation" of Western Europe from the United States. What they do want is that all the states regardless of their social systems display a high sense of responsibility for the destinies of the peoples and make their contribution to averting nuclear catastrophe and ensuring a peaceful future for the whole of mankind.

TASS: USSR WILL MATCH MISSILE BUILDUP IN EUROPE

LD181422 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1255 GMT 18 Jan 83

[Text] Moscow, 18 Jan (TASS) -- TASS political observer Vladimir Serov writes:

Washington continues stubbornly to insist on its notorious "zero option", known to be unacceptable to the USSR, and to contradict the principle of equality and equal security. This is shown by the statements just made by official representatives of the White House and the State Department. Our position as before is that of the "zero option", a White House spokesman emphasized.

Why is Washington clinging so stubbornly to its initial "zero option", whose uselessness for reaching agreement with the USSR is clear even to the U.S. representatives in Geneva themselves, and withdrawal from which is supported by many state and political figures in West Europe? Is not this stubbornness explained by the fact that the Reagan administration is not interested in achieving a just agreement in Geneva, but is striving to change the military situation in Europe to its own advantage, and thus to achieve overall military-strategic superiority?

In fact, by trying to have several hundred of its new medium-range nuclear missiles sited on the territory of West Europe, the Pentagon aspires to bring closer the [word indistinct] which can hit targets deep in the Soviet Union, and are strategic as far as it is concerned [v otnoshenii nego yavlyayetsya strategicheskim] right up to the frontiers of the socialist countries. The implementation of [words indistinct] would violate the overall strategic balance and would destabilize the entire military-strategic situation. For the Pershing II's intended to be sited in the FRG are capable of (?reaching) targets in the Soviet Union within just a few minutes. It is clear that this would significantly raise the danger of a nuclear conflict breaking out, due, among others, to a mistake or accident. It is also clear that Washington wishes in this way to place the main risk of nuclear confrontation on its European allies.

The Soviet Union has put forward a clear and equitable solution: It comes out in favor of not having a single plane or a single medium-range missile more than NATO. But if due to its lack of desire to reach an accord Washington fails to meet the USSR halfway, if it attains the deployment of its new missiles, then the Soviet Union would be compelled to draw appropriate conclusions. As USSR Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko pointed out during a speech in Bonn, equilibrium would be secured in any case, but on a higher level than at present.

What would the consequences be? The military situation on the continent would become significantly less stable, peace in Europe would become more fragile, the security of the European, and not only the European peoples, would be significantly reduced. The conclusion is obvious: The opportunity which is provided by the new, constructive proposals by the USSR and the other Warsaw Treaty states must not be missed. Time will not wait.

TEXT OF ZHUKOV ARTICLE ON SOVIET, PACT PROPOSALS

PM190919 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jan 83 Second Edition p 4

[Article by political observer Yuriy Zhukov: "Peace Offensive"]

[Text] The end of 1982 and the start of 1983 have been marked by a new manifestation of the political will of the USSR and the fraternal socialist states to resolutely improve the international situation, which has been dangerously complicated as a result of the headlong arms race unleashed by the United States and NATO.

The initiatives put forward 21 December in the report delivered by Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and 5 January in the Warsaw Pact states' Political Declaration marked, as is being said and written in the most diverse countries, the start of a great new peace offensive by the socialist countries. But this is an offensive of a particular kind: It is not one-sided. Those who initiated and are leading it are not seeking advantage only for themselves. They are acting in the interests of all countries and peoples vitally interested in halting the dangerous slide toward the abyss of nuclear catastrophe.

It is time, high time, to curb the madmen whose philosophy was expressed by U.S. Senator R. Russell, who ventured to state: "If we have to begin everything all over again (after a nuclear war) with another Adam and Eve then I want them to be Americans and not Russians and I want them to be preserved on the American Continent and not in Europe."

This devil's philosophy is translated into the language of military strategy by General Bernard Rogers, supreme commander in chief of the NATO Armed Forces in Europe, who is now responding to the socialist countries' peace offensive with vollevs of provocative interviews published in West European newspapers.

"Even if we succeeded in strengthening the conventional defense system, we would still need a full range of nuclear armaments -- from tactical to strategic. We will not even renounce the delivery of a preemptive strike," Rogers said in the Italian newspaper IL TEMPO.

"Would you press the button even if you knew that could entail a world nuclear conflict?" a correspondent from the French newspaper LIBERATION asked.

And the U.S. general, without batting an eyelid, replied that if "the political authorities" authorized him to use nuclear weapons he would do so. "These weapons," he specified, "must be used promptly enough to be able to strike targets which are not on our own territory."

It is not surprising that even in countries which are U.S. allies not only broad popular circles but even statesmen, comparing the socialist countries' new peace initiatives with admissions of this sort, are demanding increasingly loudly the speediest businesslike examination of the proposals of the USSR and the Warsaw Pact states' Political Consultative Committee, stating unambiguously their positive attitude toward them.

Here is an interesting exchange between a BBC correspondent and British Foreign Secretary Francis Pym:

"Mr Secretary, what are your preliminary impressions of the Prague declaration?"

"In my opinion it is a document of tremendous importance."

"What struck you most in these reports on the declaration?"

"Above all the fact that it suggests concluding a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force. In other words, it is a case of nonaggression.... That is very important."

"So we would very much like to sign a nonaggression pact?"

"Yes.... This declaration also contains other elements which require the most careful study and we will study them without fail."

Eminent figures of the governments of many other NATO states have expressed themselves in the same spirit. As THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote, "The United States' West European allies displayed unconcealed interest in the Warsaw Pact states' call to conclude an East-West treaty on the reciprocal nonuse of military force and the maintenance of peaceful relations."

Under these conditions even the U.S. President, who had earlier rejected out of hand all the peace proposals of the USSR and the other socialist community countries, deemed it necessary to state: "I think that this will be examined without fail if (?) what is being proposed is indeed a treaty on the reciprocal nonuse of force." Well, we will see the spirit in which Washington will examine "this." The only incomprehensible thing that "if" is doing here -- after all, the proposal on the treaty's conclusion is on the President's desk.

Incidentally, the socialist countries' Political Declaration provides not only for the conclusion of a treaty. Those taking part in the Prague conference called for the resolute activation of the talks underway and the resumption of those which have been broken off on the entire package of questions of halting the arms race, they called for a halt to the buildup of armed forces and expressed themselves in favor of a mutual strategic arms freeze by the USSR and the United States pending an accord on the reduction of these arms.

Enormous significance attaches, for instance, to these proposals formulated in the declaration:

--Drafting very speedily a treaty on the total prohibition of nuclear weapons tests;

--Accelerating the elaboration of an international convention on the prohibition and abolition of chemical weapons;

--Moving on to the elaboration of a convention on the prohibition of the neutron weapon;

--Embarking immediately on talks to ban the deployment of weapons of any type in space;

--Completing more rapidly an agreement on an international convention to prohibit radiological weapons;

--Accelerating the solution of the question of strengthening guarantees for the security of nonnuclear states.

The USSR's proposals, submitted by Comrade Yu.V. Andropov in the 21 December report, on the vitally important, urgent problems of limiting and reducing the strategic nuclear arms and medium-range nuclear weapons of the United States and the USSR, whose discussion will soon be resumed at the Geneva talks, require a constructive reply. These proposals, as many public and political figures in West Europe admit, open up a real way out of the impasse.

The peace offensive mounted by the USSR together with the fraternal socialist countries and the program of actions which the West German newspaper FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU terms "breathtaking" are meeting with mounting support in the world, primarily in West Europe and the United States. It is no accident that even the governments of NATO countries which formerly unconditionally rejected the socialist countries' peace initiatives are now stating that they intend to study the present proposals seriously and in a constructive spirit.

The British newspaper THE TIMES ascribes this, not without reason, to their fear of the further buildup of the antiwar movements.

Recalling the broad response generated in Britain, and not only in Britain, by, for instance, the actions of the women, who, despite fierce repressions, are blockading the U.S. base where the deployment of the cruise missiles is being prepared, THE TIMES writes:

"What use is it to denounce the motives of the women at Greenham Common? The govervent must show that it shares their concern at the nuclear arms race.... The NATO countries can insist that President Reagan alter his position. The question is whether they will be able to elaborate a collective decision before it is too late."

Sensible words. But we cannot fail to see that in Washington the alarm calls concerning the changes of mood emerging among the West European countries' ruling circles are meeting with no sympathy, to put it mildly. As the U.S. press frankly writes, this is borne out in particular by President Reagan's decision to send Vice President Bush to the FRG, the Netherlands, Belgium, Switzerland, Italy, France, Britain and the Vatican to "straighten out" the allies.

True, Reagan himself has stated: "The vice president's visit to our close friends and allies and the discussions he will have in the Vatican and Geneva emphasize our firm commitment to peace and security in Europe and to genuine arms reductions." However, THE WASHINGTON POST has reported, the trip has a diametrically opposite goal: "White House spokesmen have stated that Bush's trip is geared toward countering the expanding movement in West Europe against nuclear weapons and the impact on public opinion in West Euorpe."

The newspaper of U.S. business circles, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, has also written of the insincerity of members of the Washington administration. Noting that their "public posture" with regard to the socialist countries' Political Declaration is "restrained," the newspaper revealed that "confidentially" U.S. officials have "discounted" the proposals it contains.

The newspaper notes that Washington is afraid most of all that the Pentagon's plans to deploy the new U.S. missiles in the FRG in 1983 may be jeopardized inasmuch as "many Germans are attracted by the Soviet Union's recent proposal."

"So," THE WALL STREET JOURNAL writes, "to ensure that the West Germans will not succumb to these peace initiatives and reject the deployment of the U.S. missiles, Reagan administration spokesmen have stated ('confidentially,' of course! -- Yu. Zh.) that they must create the impression (!) that they take all control proposals seriously."

You read such reports attesting to the vitality of the ideas of imperial hegemonistic policy in some circles and you wonder: What are these gentlemen counting on? After all, people are not blind. However many attempts may be made to dupe people with stories about how the United States, while chasing after military superiority, is concerned with strengthening peace, they will understand and grasp the elementary truth that the more weapons there are, the stronger the threat of war and the fewer there are, the less this threat will be.

The new peace offensive undertaken by the Soviet Union together with the fraternal socialist countries is acquiring increasing significance in present-day world politics. The first responses to it already install hope of ultimate success. The paramount task of all peace-loving forces is all the more important now -- the task of reaching a point where the content of the initiatives put forward in Moscow on 21 December and in Prague on 5 January is brought home to the broadest people's masses everywhere on our planet.

PRAVDA: U.S. MOBILIZING ALLIES TO UNDERMINE DETENTE

LD190222 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0108 GMT 19 Jan 83

["The Road to a Firm Peace" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 19 Jan (TASS) -- Official Washington is striving to mobilize its allies in order to jointly destroy the material foundation of the policy of detente, PRAVDA writes today, analyzing the basic ideas of the Prague declaration. The purpose of the strategy on the other side of the ocean is to knock the supporting pillars from beneath this policy: military-strategic parity between the USSR and the United States and between the Warsaw Pact and NATO; and trade and economic cooperation among the European states. Such is the position of the present U.S. leadership regarding detente. They have taken upon themselves the intention of undermining it in the very place where it has the firmest roots, where it has achieved the greatest successes.

They want to transform the cradle of detente, including military detente which was conceived upon the European Continent, into a nuclear missile magazine and testing range, which in the event of war will inevitably be reduced to ashes, the newspaper stresses.

They intend to carry out the adventurist enterprise of "bringing up the level" of NATO's nuclear armaments beneath the false U.S. slogan of "liquidating the Soviet monopoly on medium-range nuclear devices." There are some people in Western Europe who are now intending to use this very slogan to cover up their participation in the essentially anti-European global military strategy of the "leader" of NATO.

Unfortunately, far from everyone in Western Europe yet realizes the consequences with which the implementation of Washington's strategic intention toward the Old World is fraught, PRAVDA states. The Prague Political Delcaration invites the public in Europe and the world to weigh the full measure of the danger threatening peace on the continent and beyond its borders, the full measure of the responsbility born both by those who have brought this danger to Europe and by those who, willingly or unwillingly, pander to these plans.

In their European policy, the socialist countries proceed from the fact that the present situation on the continent urgently demands mutual understanding, the unification of the efforts of all states, large and small, and the concentration of these efforts on the solution of the key problems. In the present acute situation they propose a comprehensive set of urgent and effective measures. These are political, military, economic and humanitarian measures. In the opinion of the participants in the Prague conference, implementation of them would remove tension and weaken the military threat and would be conducive to overcoming the lack of confidence in relations between states.

PRAVDA REPORTS U.S. CONFUSION OVER DISARMAMENT

PM181119 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jan 83 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Preparation Is Under Way"]

[Text] Washington, 14 Jan -- The U.S. press notes that confusion in the U.S. Administration over the disarmament issue. Meanwhile, preparations are in full swing for the deployment of the cruise and Pershing II missiles. Quoting U.S. experts, people are pointing out that "technical preparation" for the deployment of these weapons in the West European countries has already begun and that as a result their deployment may be embarked upon in the fall of 1983. The number of launchsites prepared -- about 70 -- is even cited.

Comments on the reshuffles in the leadership of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency are characterized by disagreement. THE WASHINGTON POST states that Adelman, the aagency's newly-appointed director, "has little experience in the arms control sphere." Other newspapers believe overall that people incompetent to conduct negotiations are joining the leadership. The ABC television company asserts that "control over the political administration in the arms limitation sphere will be taken on by Secretary of State G. Shultz."

From all this some bodies like the NBC television company, for instance, conclude that "ferment and chaos" are to be observed in the Reagan administration on disarmament issues. Others believe that Reagan does not really want disarmament and his statements are aimed merely at justifying the arms race policy in the eyes of the public.

U.S. LEGISLATORS DENIED ACCESS TO START TEAM

PM181303 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jan 83 Second Edition p 5

[Dispatch by correspondent A. Tolkunov under the "Rejoinder" rubric: "Undesirable Witnesses"]

[Text] New York, 14 Jan -- NEWSWEEK magazine reports that a group of U.S. legislators have been denied their request to become acquainted with the progress and details of the strategic arms limitation and reduction talks underway in Geneva between the USSR and the United States. According to Senator G. Hart, E. Rowny, the head of the U.S. delegation at the talks, had mentioned that the Soviet delegation was allegedly reluctant to meet with them.

"However," the magazine writes, "official Washington provides an utterly different explanation. It is simply that the Reagan administration fears that in direct and frank dialogue the other side will be able to convince congressmen who are in its opinion unable to grasp the finer points of these problems that the Soviet proposals are constructive and based on the principle of equality."

So that's it! Even the U.S. legislators, it turns out, are not allowed to familiarize themselves with the details of the new peace initiatives of the USSR and the Warsaw Pact states.

PRAVDA DISCUSSES U.S. STANCE AT GENEVA TALKS

LD182338 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2255 GMT 18 Jan 83

[Text] Moscow, 19 January (TASS) -- Under the heading "Washington Continues To Block a Solution," PRAVDA today publishes the following editorial article: [redaktsionnaya statya -- Moscow TASS in English at 0008 GMT on 19 January carries a report on the PRAVDA article and identifies it as an "editorial", not "editorial article."]

The White House press spokesman made a statement in which he claimed that the United States is allegedly occupying a "flexible position" at the Geneva Talks and is proposing that "the entire class of ground-based medium-range missiles" be liquidated.

According to him, the Soviet Union, on the contrary, "is seeking to freeze the quantity of its missiles in order to extract advantages for itself," to maintain (its) "monopoly in medium-range systems." A statement in this respect was also made by a U.S. State Department spokesman, who repeated word for word what had been stated by the White House spokesman. But both the first and second statements completely distort the state of affairs at the talks in Geneva. American proposals on the so-called "zero option" do not envisage any liquidation of a "class of armaments," as is claimed in the White House and State Department statments.

After all, Washington is not proposing that the ballistic missiles of Britain and France, i.e., NATO member-states that are not taking part in the Geneva talks, be liquidated. And what is more, the class of medium-range armaments itself consists, as is known, not only of missiles but also of aircraft. So, by proposing that only the Soviet missiles be liquidated, Washington would wish to leave untouched all aircraft and all medium-range missiles on the NATO side.

What would be the results of such reductions? A twofold superiority for NATO over the USSR in the number of carriers, and a threefold superiority in the number of nuclear warheads, a continuation of the nuclear arms race at sea and in the air, i.e., where the United States reckons it most advantageous and promising for itself.

Can this be a realistic solution to the problem? No, and no again. The so-called "zero option" of the United States means nothing other than a desire to one-sidedly disarm the Soviet Union. It does not advance the solution of the problem by a single step forward, which we have stated more than once. The American proposals, and this is evident from the negotiations in Geneva, are devoid of commonsense. They reflect a biased approach to the matter, a disdain for the interests of Europe. And they were thought up merely in order to block a solution to the problem of reducing nuclear weapons on the European Continent.

During the negotiations in Geneva, the Soviet Union has raised a whole series of far-reaching proposals. The whole world knows about them. It is prepared to accept having exactly as many missiles in the European zone as Britain and France have, and to reduce everything else in Europe, including our most up-to-date missiles. We also agree to establish equal levels for corresponding aircraft. The British and French missiles are a real fact of the strategic situation, and we are saying that their existence must be taken into account in calculating the respective weapons on the NATO side. But the question of reducing the missiles belonging to Britain and France is not being proposed at the negotiations between us and the United States.

Our proposals give a real opportunity to solve the problem of limiting nuclear armaments in Europe in a just manner and on a long-term basis. If the other side is striving to reach an understanding, this should be demonstrated by actions. They must give a reply to the Soviet proposals on the substance of the matter. And from this reply, people will be able to judge who is striving to protect Europe from the threat of a nuclear conflict.

Judging from what is being said by representatives of the White House and the State Department, the U.S. Administration has no real program for solving the question of limiting nuclear armaments in Europe. It does not have one and never has had one. Washington, as one can assume, has concentrated totally on preparing to deploy hundreds of new U.S. missiles on the European Continent. And now they are having recourse to repetitions and juggling with the facts, stating that the American "zero option," they say, is better than the Soviet proposals.

Now let us consider the White House statements alleging that the USSR would like to "freeze" its own missiles and thus ensure an advantage for itself. And here there is not one word that is true. The USSR is prepared, if an understanding is reached with the United States on reducing and limiting nuclear armaments in Europe, to reduce its missiles by hundreds and to not have one medium-range missiles more than Britain and France. And if the number of British and French missiles should be reduced, then the number of Soviet missiles would also be reduced. No one is able to distort this honorable position of the USSR, which is understandable to everyone.

A real opportunity does exist to halt the growth of nuclear arsenals in Europe and embark on their reduction. It was created by the constructive proposals of the Soviet Union, set forth in the report by Comrade Yu.V. Andropov on 21 December 1982. This opportunity was created precisely by the Soviet Union. But the United States, on the contrary, did everything to continue the nuclear arms race, to try to break the regional and global balance of forces in its own favor.

The "zero option," which is importunately proposed by the White House as a solution to the question, will not produce agreement at Geneva and cannot produce it. The Soviet Union will not agree to unilateral disarmament and to ensuring military advantages for NATO countries, and it has repeatedly declared this.

The opportunity for agreement does exist. It is up to the United States of America: Does it want to come to an agreement on this question or not. So far the United States of America has not given a persuasive answer to this. The problems cannot be solved through the U.S. 'zero option.' Agreement is possible only on the basis of equality and equal security.

IZVESTIYA ON DEVELOPMENT, USE OF U.S. SLBM'S

LD191040 Moscow TASS in English 1033 GMT 19 Jan 83

[Text] Moscow January 19 TASS -- The newspaper IZVESTIYA has published under the heading "A False Stand" the following editorial article today:

An inseparable component part of an effective solution to the problem of limitation and reduction of strategic weapons must be a limitation of the strategic sea-based weapons, submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBM's) and the ballistic missile submarines themselves.

At the Geneva talks the U.S. side has put forward a proposal, according to which the SLBM's of the USSR and the USA should be reduced. Outwardly it might seem that the point at issue is a reduction of the level of nuclear confrontation. But this is a purely superficial impression, which only uninformed people can form.

But, as a matter of fact, in declaring seemingly for a reduction in the number of SLBM's, Washington builds its sand in such a way that the programme now being implemented by the Pentagon for a rearmament of the American submarine fleet with Trident missiles and submarines of a new type be actually left intact. The Ohio, the first of the submarines of the new type has already been put into service. This programme is directed at sharply increasing the combat potentialities of the U.S. strategic force at sea. It is planned to spend on the programme sums running into tens of billions of dollars.

American propaganda claims that the Trident system is allegedly a defenseive one, aimed at increasing the survivability of one of the components of the American strategic means, since, they claim, submarines of the Ohio type will be hard to detect in the ocean and, consequently, their vulnerability will be lessened. But this verbiage is deliberately aimed at glossing over the main thing, which is the essence of the Trident program, precisely the combat characteristics of the missiles to be mounted on board new American submarines.

It is known that the American Trident-1 sea based missiles, which are already in service, have sufficiently high capabilities for being used to hit "hard" targets, that is for launching the first strike. As far as the SLBM of the next generation, which is being intensively developed nowadays, the Trident-2, is concerned, it, as is admitted in the USA itself, will practically not differ from the new MX intercontinental ballistic missile in either the accuracy of firing or in the yield of the warheads mounted on it. It is not fortuitous that to this day there are plans in the USA to have on that basis a single new missile for deployment both on land and at sea.

If one takes into account also the fact that on being advanced towards the borders of the USSR the Trident missiles are capable of reaching targets on Soviet territory much faster than the U.S. ICMB's, thus sharply reducing the time for warning about a nuclear attack, one can clearly see what hopes are pinned by Washington on the creation of that type of strategic weapons. There is no doubt that the main task, which the Trident program is designed to solve, is to increase sharply the offensive potential of the United States, to put into the Pentagon's hands by means of the new SLBM's the capability to launch a surprise attack. This, as they say, does not even smell of defence.

Correspondingly, one realises also the line pursued by the U.S. side on the question of the sea-based means in the context of the talks on strategic arms. To put it briefly -- and this is seen also from the previous experience of the SALT-2 talks -- it boils down to obstructing proposals that would stop the arms race in that direction and would thus serve the cause of stabilizing the situation.

The USA adheres to the same line now at the talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic arms. The "reductions" of SLBM's proposed by it actually legalise the American program for the deployment of Trident missiles and submarines of the Ohio type, as, in accordance with those proposals, the obsolescent submarines with Polaris missiles, and subsequently also with the Poseidon, which as it is are being phased out, would be subject to "reductions" by the USA. As far as the SLBM's and submarines of new types are concerned, they would be deployed at the rate planned earlier. In other words, they are talking of reductions, but the result is a continuation and even a build-up of the arms race in the hope of gaining unilateral advantages in it.

It is apt to recall in this connection that at the SALT-2 talks several years ago Washington declined the Soviet proposal on a renunciation on a mutual basis of the creation of the sea-based Trident missile system in the USA and the corresponding system in the Soviet Union. In the course of the current talks when the Soviet side declared for limiting the deployment of the Ohio type ballistic missile submarines in the USA and the Typhoon in the USSR to a certain number and establishing strict limitations on their armaments, the USA again would not even listen to the proposal to reach agreement on that score.

One can clearly see from the example of the approach by the U.S. side to the question of sea-based strategic weapons that lopsidedness of the general American approach to the questions of the limitation and reduction of strategic arms. In its striving to inflict the greatest damage upon the Soviet Union's security, the American side invents absolutely groundless arguments about a particularly destabilsing role of the ICBM's, puts forward proposals that would lead to unproportionally large cuts of Soviet land-based nuclear-missile forces. As to the weapons, on which the USA puts a special stake -- cruise missiles or SLBM's, they are arbitrarily proclaimed as being "less destabilizing" and therefore are either not subject to limitations in general, to such limitations that would leave intact the corresponding American military programs.

It must be clear that the approach of this kind cannot serve as a basis for a mutually acceptable agreement. In accordance with the principle of equality and equal security, all types of strategic weapons in their totality must be limited and reduced, certainly, in such a manner that neither of the sides should gain any advantages to the detriment of the other side's security nuclear arms race. There is no other way.

And it is time for Washington to realise this if they in Washington wish progress at the talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic arms.

PRAVDA REVIEWS ARMS ISSUES, MIDDLE EAST

PM181053 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jan 83 Second Edition p 4

[Vladimir Bolshakov "International Review"]

[Text] Politics on the Move

The discussion of the new peace proposals put forward in recent speeches by Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and in the Prague Political Declaration by the Warsaw Pact states continues on the front pages of foreign newspapers. They are being discussed everywhere and at all levels -- from public to government.

The Soviet Union's proposals at the talks with the United States on medium-range weapons in the European zone and on strategic nuclear armaments, as was noted during the 11 January meeting between Yu.V. Andropov and Hans-Jochen Vogel, Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD) candidate for the FRG federal chancellorship, open up a realistic path to just agreements on a radical reduction of nuclear arsenals which do not damage the security of either side and to the strengthening of mutual trust and general security. The same goal is pursued by the initiatives set out in the Political Declaration adopted in Prague, among which the world press singles out for special mention the proposal on concluding a treaty on mutual nonuse of military force and the mantenance of relations of peace between the Warsaw Pact states and the NATO countries.

The broad response to these proposals from the hearts and minds of people on all continents is evidence not only of their topicality and correct timing, but also of the good will of the Soviet Union and its fraternal countries who have confirmed anew that socialism and peace are inseparable.

"World politics are on the move," West German television states. "The West has been subjected to a peace offensive by the USSR." For all the brashness of this TV headline, it reflects pretty accurately the state of affairs in world politics which has been given a fillip from Moscow and Prague. Many Western leaders, foreign papers write, had to emerge prematurely from their traditional Christmas holiday political slumber and subject the socialist community countries' proposals to serious scrutiny.

The peoples endorse the appeal from Prague to the West to consider the proposal most attentively and are demanding a businesslike response. With a few exceptions, the NATO countries' capitals are not risking a "rejection stance," as one U.S. journalist described the now traditional statements by Western figures of reluctance to examine any Soviet proposals on strengthening detente and reducing armaments.

What are the reasons for this reaction? There are many. But the main one, of course, is that the proposals put forward in Moscow and Prague were carefully thought out, are plainly realistic and take into account the interests of both the NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries. As the TIMES noted, if the West were to ignore them it could mean, above all, that its leaders might forfeit their influence on the electorate for a long time or for good. To preserve it and "public calm" as well, the paper writes, "NATO must put forward positive counterproposals and not just reject all the Soviet initiatives" and, moreover, must display a "greater sense of realism."

The anxiety shown by the venerable bourgeois press organ for "calm" is understandable in view of the present unparalleled growth of the movement for peace and disarmament. The British women's round-the-clock vigil outside the Greenham Common military base, where the United States intends to deploy its new medium-range cruise missiles, the antimissile marches in Italy, Belgium, the FRG and the Netherlands, the growing pressure in the United States in favor of a freeze on nuclear missile arsenals and the church's increasingly active opposition to the arms race are a natural reaction to the barbaric plans of the strategists of "limited" and "protracted" nuclear war in whom anticommunism clearly prevails over common sense.

And common sense demands that the flywheel of the arms race be halted, that the nuclear threat to mankind be eliminated and that the massive amounts of money spent on armaments be used for peaceful purposes. In our world, where one person in five is poverty-stricken, hungry, illiterate and vegetating in conditions unfit for human beings, around $1 million per minute is being spent on military needs, according to UN data. And imperialism is to blame for this.

Its policy of fueling international tension and militarism hits not only the economies of the developing countries, which are suffering from the crisis imported from the West, but also the industrial capitalist countries themselves. Awareness of this fact is a significant reason why even certain inveterate "hawks" are showing themselves to be disposed toward detente. They are motivated certainly not by sympathy for detente but the fear that the seething cauldron of social discontent could shake the whole "free enterprise" system, to its foundations. Around 20 million unemployed in the United States, over 32 million in all the developed capitalist countries and around 300 million unemployed in the developing countries represents a massive explosive potential. The "guillotining" of aid programs for the underprivileged in favor of arms expenditure only increases this potential.

A number of reasons for the West's "cautious interest" (the term used by the British paper THE GUARDIAN) in the Soviet proposals is to be found in mutual relations within the NATO bloc itself, which is by no means unanimous on the entire range of international problems. For many West European leaders, for example, the prospects of a reduction in medium-range weapons in the European zone are tied up with their political future, which is especially noticeable today, on the threshold of the forthcoming elections in the FRG, planned for 6 March. It is characteristic that these problems should have come to the forefront in the election campaign, pushing into the background even such an urgent concern as unemployment. It is not beyond the realm of possibility that there will be an early election in the spring in Britain as well. And in both countries, the Western press notes, opposition parties are prompting governments to think about something more rational than the "zero option" which, as is known, the White House is insisting on at the Geneva talks on medium-range weapons.

The purpose of U.S. Vice President G. Bush's trip to Western Europe, announced this week, is to "reassure the allies" and compel them to adopt a "united NATO countries' approach" to the proposals by the USSR and the other Warsaw Pact states. The only question is on what basis is the common stance to be worked out? THE WASHINGTON POST writes that Bush's trip has "just one drawback: the need to explain Ronald Reagan's policy on nuclear disarmament. Indeed, no one knows the President's real view of the prospects of starting talks with the Soviet Union for the purpose of concluding an agreement. The President is as changeable as the weather on this matter."

Judging by a number of press reports, the West European capitals suspect that the optimstic forecasts concerning the outcome of the Geneva talks and the assurances of "devotion to the cause of peace and disarmament" reiterated in R. Reagan's 12 January speech were motivated primarily by deference to the allies and the approaching 1984 presidential elections. As far as the Washington administration is concerned now is very much the time to be appearing in front of the U.S. electorate and the West Europeans in the role of "peacemaker," especially in view of the fact that its "program for normalizing the economy," the U.S. press states, has failed. This administration clearly has no intention of abandoning the arms race. This is evidenced by the budget statistics for fiscal 1984, according to which defense expenditure will be around $250 billion. This is confirmed, incidentally, by a letter, which the press learned of the other day, from Reagan to influential Congresman J. Kemp in which the President stated that "if he does not get the MX missile it is in the cards that the arms reduction talks in Geneva will be called off." According to the WASHINGTON POST the letter made "many people's hair stand on end," especially "in the European capitals, where politicians get the shivers when they think about the deployment of the new missiles and the absence of any progress at the Geneva talks." Washington's "changeability" does not make them "shiver" any less. Commenting on the shake-up in the leadership of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, which is in charge of the Geneva talks with the USSR, the West European press notes that what needs changing most is the U.S. approach to a problem which is so important for the cause of peace. And this is precisely what is not happening.

Reports are already appearing in the press that in Geneva, where the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear arms limitation in Europe will resume at the end of January, the U.S. delegation intends to insist on the not unknown "zero option." In this context the fears of those Europeans who express the opinion that Washington intends to prolong the Geneva talks as long as possible and, by hook or by crook, deploy the Pentagon's new nuclear missile arsenal on their soil, are justified. This is a deliberately immoral [porochnyy] approach. It will not ensure Europe's peace and security.

Now, when in accordance with the peace proposals put forward in Prague, a practical opportunity is opening up for halting the current dangerous development of events, diverting them into a healthy channel, strengthening mutual confidence and resolving successive tasks of limiting and reducing the arsenals of weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, it depends on the United States and its NATO allies whether the opportunity for preventing the buildup of nuclear missiles in Europe will be realized and whether the threat to the people of the continent and indeed the world as a whole will be reduced or, conversely, sharply increased. The peoples of the world are entitled to demand that the West make constructive moves and make use of the historic opportunity for preventing a thermonuclear catastrophe.

End the Aggression

A meeting was held in the Kremlin 12 January between Soviet leaders and a PLO delegation headed by Y. 'Arafat, chairman of the PLO Executive Committee. Commenting extensively on the talks which have been held, the world's press notes that the participants in them resolutely condemned Israel's criminal aggression against the Palestinian and other Arab peoples, which is continuing with U.S. complicity, and Israel's acts of terror and repression in the occupied Arab lands.

This year marks 35 years since the founding of the Israeli state. And the Palestinian Arab people's struggle for the creation of their own state as envisaged by the 1947 UN decision has covered the same period. The imperialists and Zionists are to blame for the fact that it has still not been created. Hundreds of thousands of Palestinians have been driven out of their lands and real genocide as symbolized by the mass killing of defenseless old men, women and children committed throughout those years -- from Dayr Yasin in 1948 to Sabra and Shatila in 1982 -- has been unleashed against them.

Invariably the murderers have carried weapons given to them by their Washington protectors. And not for unselfish reasons. This week U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger has stated that a new command of the "rapid deployment forces" -- the Pentagon's police corps -- will be set up in the Near East in the near future. That is a distinctive climax to the "peace efforts" begun by Israeli and U.S. diplomacy after the 1973 Arab-Israeli war and continued with As-Sadat's complicity at Camp David in 1978.

It was stated at that time that the Camp David deal alone opened the way to a Near East settlement. The years since then attest to the direct opposite -- the Camp David agreements freed Israel's hands for new aggression against the Arab countries, for the invasion of Lebanon and for new acts of genocide against the Palestinians.

Washington has been using Tel Aviv to try to secure for itself new Pentagon bridgeheads in the Near East and is quite undisturbed by the fact that they have been built on the blood and bones of the Arabs. It is to that objective that all U.S. policy in the region has been subordinated since 1973, and for its implementation use has been made both of unprecedented arms supplies to Israel and of various "peace efforts" -- for Kissinger's "shuttle diplomacy" to Washington envoy Habib's "mediation."

On the White House's decision, Habib has now gone to the Near East again with the aim of helping Israel to twist the arms of the Lebanese and force Beirut to sign a "peace treaty" on the Tel Aviv aggressor's terms. The Israeli military is meanwhile continuing to commit atrocities on Lebanese soil, to which "fresh" units and military hardware are being dispatched. Despite all the UN resolutions, the aggression against Lebanon is continuing. Tel Aviv is also threatening other states in the region, primarily Syria, with new "punitive actions."

The assimilation of what has been seized is continuing behind the screen of "peace initiatives." The Israeli Government has announced the construction of new settlements on the occupied west Bank of the Jordan and in the Gaza Strip.

As usual Washington is feigning displeasure at the news of these actions by its henchman. But in fact U.S. protection of and complicity with the aggressor are continuing. By its maneuvers Washington is trying to divert public attention from the task of ending the Israeli aggression and achieving the withdrawal of Tel Aviv's troops from Lebanese soil, a task which has lost none of its urgency. On the other hand, the Americans, to the accompaniment of publicity uproar over the "new" U.S. "peace initiatives" are ensconcing their troops in Lebanon and are forgetting about the promised withdrawal....

The Arab peoples and the countries supporting them, primarily the Soviet Union, are fully resolved to strive for a just and all-embracing Near East settlement, an inalienable component of which must be the implementation of the Palestinian Arab people's national rights including their right to self-determination and the creation of their own independent state.

A constructive path toward this, as was noted during the Kremlin talks with the PLO delegation, is opened up by the USSR's proposal to convene an international conference on the Near East in which the PLO -- the Palestinian people's sole legitimate representative -- must also take part on an equal footing with other countries.

IZVESTIYA ON ROLE OF NEW U.S. CENTRAL COMMAND

PM181235 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Jan 83 Morning Edition p 4

[Melor Sturua "IZVESTIYA International Review": "The 'Central Command' -- U.S. Imperialism's Big Stick"]

[Text] There has been a frightening tradition for some time now in the United States -- people receive Christmas and New Year's gifts concealing a threat of death: toys containing explosive devices, festive pies filled with needles or razor blades and so forth. These "practical jokes" as they are called, are usually the handiwork of criminals or lunatics. The most recent holiday period was no exception, either. But I think that I would not be wrong in saying that the Pentagon outdid everyone in this respect. The militarist Santa Claus left mankind a "gift" under the New Year's tree that was somewhat more cutting then any of the "practicaljokes" played by the schizophrenics and criminals. According to the official label, it is called the "Central Command."

The "Central Command," whose date of birth was 1 January 1983, is convincing new evidence of U.S. imperialism's striving for world hegemonism and domination of the whole world's fate. It is a component of Washington's global militarist preparations, which are filled with tension and confrontation the way the pies are filled with blades. Of course, the "Central Command's creators themselves describe it quite differently. Thus the U.S. defense secretary has stated that it has been created "to defend U.S. interests against all military threats," "vital" interests, of course.

But is that how matters really are? A mere factual account of the "Central Command's" parameters cuts the ground out from under such assertions. Let us begin with the fact that the tentacles of the "Central Command," or Centcom, will grip a huge part of the globe -- from the Near East across the oil-bearing Persian Gulf to the Indian Ocean. The "Central Command's" zone of operations embraces the territory of 19 countries -- from Pakistan in the east to Egypt in the west, and from Iran in the north to Kenya in the south. And the complete "exhaustive" list of these countries reads like this: Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Bahrain, the United Arab Emirates, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Oman, North Yemen, South Yemen, Somalia, Sudan, Kenya, Ethiopia, Djibouti, Egypt and Jordan.

The tentacles of the new military octopus radiate from the MacDill Air Force Base near Tampa, Florida. That is where the "Central Command" headquarters are located. (It is by no means a coincidence that the planning department of the Rapid Deployment Force is also stationed there.) In peacetime the Centcom commander will be directly under the orders of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff and will formulate plans for "possible wartime operations" as well as carrying out "military cooperation" functions with allied governments in the region and overseeing military aid programs. (A thinly veiled loophole for interference in those countries' internal affairs.)

The creation of the "Central Command is the dangerous outcome of the militarist way of thinking which has established itself and has now become dominant in official Washington. According to this "way of thinking," the world does not consist of sovereign states but is divided into theaters of military operations.

The globalism of such thinking consists, among other things, in the fact that U.S. imperialism is switching increasingly openly from assimilating individual "theaters" to linking them comprehensively. Centcom's creation is indeed a switch from the orientation toward individual military bases and strongpoints to the formation of broader bridgeheads of aggression. This trend sheds further light on the genuine motives of Washington's attempts to intensify and expand its military presence in a number of areas, to impose unequal agreements on other countries and to use their territory as Pentagon military springboards.

Nor is the "linkup" between Centcom and the Rapid Deployment Force by any means coincidental, either. The latter was created back under the Carter administration allegedly in response to events in Iran and Afghanistan. It is now clear that those events were merely a pretext for fashioning the latest modernized imperialist and neocolonialist big stick. The Pentagon officially regards the "Central Command" as the "next stage after the rapid deployment joint task force." The official statement on Centcom's creation says that "in the event of an emergency this new command will be able to utilize contingents of Rapid Deployment Force personnel based primarily in the United States." The Pentagon has already placed a number of formations -- 11 tactical air squadrons, divisions of the 18th Airborne Corps, 3 carrier-borne strike groups and so forth -- at the "Central Command's" disposal. In the long term, all Rapid Deployment Force contingents -- aproximately 250,000 men -- will pass into Centcom control.

In a recent interview in THE WASHINGTON POST U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger stated quite frankly that the absorption of the Rapid Deployment Force by the Centcom structure is "something more than a change of name" and that it is a question of a truly global reorganization aimed at deploying imperialism's "fire brigades" in literally all corners of the globe. The following detail is highly indicative: Weinberger admitted that the "experience" of Britain, which "suddenly found it necessary to move its forces to the Falkland Islands," played a significant part in accelerating the process of Centcom's creation. If you bear in mind that the British Tories' Falklands adventure was a classic relapse into imperialist and colonialist politics, the character of the newly created U.S. "Central Command" becomes even clearer.

Above I listed all 19 countries belonging to Centcom's zone of operation, or, to use the Pentagon's propaganda jargon, the "sphere of U.S. vital interests." It is not difficult to ascertain for oneself -- you only have to glace at the map of the world -- that it is a question of states located many thousands of kilometers from the United States. But here it is not a matter of elementary geographical distance. Washington is trying to impose its military-political rule on a whole series of sovereign states by arbitrarily including them in all kinds of "spheres" and "zones" without asking them, even as a formality, whether they agree to this.

The unceremoniousness of official Washington, juggling for its own selfish purposes with the fates of states and continents, is as boundless as Centcom's breadth of operation. Equally boundless is its hypocrisy: While breaking lances for "human rights," Washington is cynically trampling on the rights of entire peoples; while dilating on the "inviolability of the individual" it plunders the natural wealth of other countries and deprives them of their natural right to dispose of their own reserves of resources. Not for nothing are all oil-bearing regions declared by Washington to be the sphere of its "vital interests." And not for nothing does Pentagon chief Weinberger bluntly state in the above-mentioned interview that the Rapid Deployment Force and Centcom are "automatically oriented toward the oilfields."

And thus Centcom was hatched from the Rapid Deployment Force. But even this command is not the "end of the line," a group of 100 officers has been set up at the MacDill airbase to formulate plans for moving U.S. Armed Forces to regions going beyond the bounds of even the seemingly vast "Central Command."

Africa south of the Sahara is one such region, for example. Israel, Lebanon and Syria, for their part, are to be shared "on an amicable basis" between Centcom and NATO. According to Admiral James Watkins, U.S. Navy chief of staff, "it is very important for NATO to take a more flexible view of its geographical borders than in the past." This "flexibility" on the admiral's part essentially nullifies the fundamental norm of international law represented by the sanctity and inviolability of sovereign states' borders.

The "Central Command's" creation is a stage in Washington's global hegemonist policy and an important part of the strategic plan to establish U.S. supremacy in southwest Asia, East Africa and the Near East. It is against the backdrop of this strategy that one should view Washington's course of achieving military superiority at sea and the plans to build 150 new warships in the main classes and to increase its total fleet to 600 ships. Addressing the recommissioning ceremony of the battleship New Jersey at Long Beach, California, President Reagan openly called for "primacy" and "military superiority" to be secured so as to "obtain access to all the world's oceans and control of the air and the surface and depths of the oceans." Nothing less: When the battleship New Jersey was decommissioned in 1969, its commander said in his farewell speech: "Sleep peacefully, my friend! But do not sleep too deeply or else you will not hear the signal when you are again called to struggle for freedom!" That sea wolf seemed to know something in advance. The recommissioning of battleships is supremely symbolic. "Battleships will provide us with a rapid reaction to events in Third World countries," Vice Admiral Rowden, U.S. Navy deputy chief of staff, said in the Senate. What events, in this instance? If you recall that the "struggle for freedom" waged by the New Jersey consisted of the barbarous bombardment of Korea and Vietnam, the answer to that question will present no special difficulty.

Finally, the "Central Command's creation is part of the Pentagon's strategy which envisages waging several wars simultaneously. "We realize," Weinberger has said, "that we may have to defend our interests in more than one theater of operations at any one time, and when people say that we are trying to do too much I always ask, what, precisely, we should abandon?"

U.S. ruling circles are abandoning a policy of peace and cooperation in favor of a policy of war and confrontation. Herein lies the real reason for Washington's negative attitude toward the Soviet initiatives aimed at the relaxation of international tension, particularly in the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean. Those who are creating Centcom, of course, are not interested in resuming the Soviet-U.S. talks on the Indian Ocean. Those who are forging the Rapid Deployment Force, of course, would like to bury the Soviet initiative for ensuring peace in the Persian Gulf and on the approaches to it. Those whose military-political records are adorned by Diego Garcia and Camp David, who urged Israel on to bloody aggression in Lebanon, who are unleashing mercenary gangs on Democratic Afghanistan and who are taking advantage of the fratricidal Iran-Iraq conflict neither desire nor want those regions to be turned into peace zones. While the Soviet Union is striving to begin the very important process of reducing the military presence in various parts of the world's oceans, Washington is trying to transform them into its own nuclear missile lake and to get its paws on the "surface and the depths," as Reagan said during the second christening of the New Jersey. That is how the Pentagon's "New Year's gift" to mankind can be interpreted in all its many variations.

Our country also has vital interests, not mythical but very real interests, in the regions embraced by Centcom's tentacles since those regions are located close to our borders and our friends' borders. That is why the Soviet Union cannot be indifferent to what the Pentagon headquarters and the MacDill base are cooking up.

We would like the situation in those regions to be normal and peaceful. That is why the Soviet Union counters the imperialist doctrine of aggression and diktat with a doctrine of peace and security. You only have to compare Washington's "New Year's gift" with the peace initiatives launched by the Soviet Union just before and in the first few days of the New Year to see that for yourself.

The Warsaw Pact states' Political Declaration, adopted recently in Prague notes with anxiety that the development of world events is acquiring an increasingly dangerous character as a result of the further activization of the aggressive forces. As that outstanding historic document stresses, "Old hotbeds of tension are flaring up, new conflicts and crisis situations are erupting.... Imperialist circles are conducting a policy of strength, pressure, diktat, interference in the internal affairs of others and infringement of the national independence and sovereignty of states and are also striving to consolidate and redivide 'spheres of influence.'"

U.S. imperialism's creation of the "Central Command" is a new and certainly the latest example of how profound, precise and topical this analysis is. No demagoguery about the "Soviet military threat" and no waving of the banner of false "freedoms" can hide these facts and realities from the world public.

SOLTAN WARNS AGAINST U.S. MILITARY STRATEGY

LD182337 Moscow World Service in English 1400 GMT 18 Jan 83

[Text] The American news agency UPI have got hold of a secret report of the Pentagon and the U.S. National Security Council entitled: Fiscal 1984-88: Defense Guidance. This report, writes our commentator Yuriy Soltan outlines the basic new American military strategy.

News appeared in the media earlier that the Pentagon had worked out such a strategy on personal instructions of the President. For example, last summer, THE NEW YORK TIMES reported that the U.S. military command had received instructions to produce plans for preparing for a protracted nuclear war against the USSR in order to win the war. The U.S. defense secretary, Caspar Weinberger, was furious then about the leakage of the secret directive. He even sent a special letter to the publishers of leading American and West European newspapers in which he tried to refute the tell-tale information.

Now, journalists have before them the entire secret Pentagon report. The report fully confirms the earlier news. It says directly that the most important element of the American military strategy is escalation of a conflict to a full-scale nuclear war. It claims the United States has a possibility to win such a war. The stake is on a first nuclear strike on targets in the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Treaty countries. In other words, nuclear aggression is planned frankly. The report lists measures for active militarization of outer space. It also says that the United States must be ready to move its troops to the Middle East, even if it might seem that a threat had appeared to the security of access to the oil and the Persian Gulf area. [sentence as heard]

The Pentagon pins special hope on American medium-range nuclear missiles, which will begin to be deployed in Western Europe this coming fall. For the United States, cruise missiles and especially Pershing II's, which take between 4 and 6 minutes to reach their target, are obviously a first-strike weapon. As Washington strategists plans to use them in war, they expose their West European allies in advance to a retaliatory nuclear blow, in the hope that the United States will emerge unharmed across the Atlantic.

But these are futile hopes. It is as absurd to count that a nuclear war, once started, may become winnable for the United States. If it is ever to break out, a nuclear war will have no winners. It is certain to lead to the destruction of whole nations, to enormous devastation and disastrous consequences for the civilization and for the very life on earth.

Just as he did before, Caspar Weinberger is trying to justify himself following the publication of this report by the UPI news agency. He alleges that the Pentagon directive had been made for the express purpose of getting more appropriations for the Defense Department.

But surely, practical actions are a fine indication of the secret calculations made by the American leaders. Their refusal to follow the Soviet example and pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons is one indication. Record high military budgets are another. There is also unwillingness to have constructive talks with the USSR to reduce strategic arms and medium-range nuclear delivery vehicles in Europe. All that points to the exceedingly dangerous line of the Washington administration for all the peoples.

PRAVDA REPORTS ON U.S.-PRC TEXTILE TALKS

PM181103 [Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 15 January, Second Edition, publishes on page 5 two TASS reports under the general heading "Ended Without Results."

The first report, datelined Washington 14 January, has been compared with the Moscow TASS English item published in the 14 January Soviet Union Daily Report, page B 5, and was found to be identical.

The second report, datelined Beijing, 14 January, reads as follows:

"The XINHUA agency reports that the head of the Chinese delegation at the talks, Li Dengshan, stated that 'responsibility for the failure of the fourth round of the talks, which lasted a week and during which no agreement was successfully reached, must rest with the U.S. side.'

"During the talks, he noted, the U.S. delegation not only did not abandon the stringent restrictions unilaterally imposed at the end of last year on imports of Chinese textiles but, in contravention of commitments it had previously adopted, advanced new demands unacceptable to the Chinese side, for a further reduction in Chinese textile exports to the United States."

"'All this clearly shows,' Li Dengshan said, 'that the U.S. side does not want to resolve this problem, but on the contrary is stepping up its discriminatory trade measures against China.'"

SOVIET EMBASSY HOLDS RECEPTION IN BEIJING

Chinese Officials Attend

GF181304 Tashkent International Service in Uighur 1230 GMT 29 Dec 82

[Text] The Soviet Embassy in the PRC has held a reception and festive night for the representatives of the central PRC institutions, the cultural departments and the people of the capital on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the Soviet Union.

Soviet artists Tamara Sinyavskaya, Vladimir Malchenko and others who arrived in Beijing, displayed their skills. Also, an exhibition of paintings was organized at the place where the reception was held dedicated to the 60th anniversary of the Soviet Union and depicting the life and (?development) of the peoples in a number of Soviet republics.

Among those attending the reception were Qian Qichen, PRC vice minister of foreign affairs, Lu Zhixian, PRC vice minister of culture, and Xie Bangding, chairman of the PRC-Soviet Freindship Society.

Soviet Singer Quoted

PM141641 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 6 Jan 83 p 7

["Our correspondent" M. Ignatyeva interview with singer T. Sinyavskaya: "Concerts in Beijing"]

[Text] The trip to the PRC of a group of Soviet artists consisting of USSR Bolshoy Theater soloists singer T. Sinyavskaya and V. Malchenko, accompanist V. Viktorov, and pianist A. Slobodyanik ended on New Year's Eve. Our correspondent M. Ignatyeva asked Tamara Ilinichna Sinyavskaya, People's Artist of the USSR, to describe their performance in that country.

"During our stay in Beijing we gave four concerts. The first was for workers at the Soviet Embassy at a festive soiree devoted to the 60th anniversary of the formation of the USSR. Our program lasted nearly 2 hours, without an interval. I sang romances and arias by classical Russian composers -- Glinka, Chaykovskiy, Rimskiy-Korsakov and Rakhmaninov -- and works by Soviet composers -- Prokofyev and Shchedrin -- and as an encore several classical works of foreign music. Vladimir Malchenko's repertoire also contained Russian and foreign classics: romances and arias from operas. I and my colleague were accompanied by Vladimir Viktorov. The pianist Aleksandr Slobodyanik chose works by Rakhmaninov and Chopin for his performance.

"Our fellow countrymen employed at the embassy gave us a very warm reception and many of those who heard the first program then attended all the group's performances.

"The audience for the second concert, also on the territory of the Soviet Embassy, consisted of Chinese officials. Here, in addition to classical Russian and foreign works and a Soviet repertoire, Malchenko and I each sang a Chinese song in Chinese. Incidentally, after the concert many people from the audience came up to us and spoke in Russian. One woman told us that she had once studied at the Moscow Conservatoire with Tamara Milashkina.

"Our group performed for members of the diplomatic corps with a slightly changed program including Italian and French music, as well as Russian."

"The final concert was organized at the Beijing Conservatoire. At the meeting with students and teachers from this educational establishment there was a sort of exchange of experience: A number of musical pieces were staged through the efforts of the students and their teachers, and then we were given the stage. I sang Rakhmaninov's 'Siren," Lelya's third song from 'The Snow Maiden', 'Katerina' by Prokofyev and a Chinese song.

"Our meetings in Beijing took place in a friendly atmosphere. Literally on New Year's Eve, on 31 December, we stepped onto Soviet soil again."

REPORTS, COMMENTS ON U.S. VISIT BY JAPAN'S NAKASONE

TV Report

LD182038 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 18 Jan 83

[From the "World Today" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] Yasuhiro Nakasone, prime minister of Japan, is on an official visit to Washington. Today he is meeting U.S. President Ronald Reagan. He will also be having talks with Secretary of State Shultz, Secretary of Defense Weinberger and Treasury Secretary Regan.

In the opinion of observers, difficult talks await the Japanese prime minister. Representatives of the American Administration are not hiding the fact that they intend to adopt a tough stand and put pressure on their Japanese partners on all problems under discussion. First and foremost, this concerns America's demand that Japan considerably increase its military preparations. According to a State Department spokesman, President Ronald Reagan will be trying to wring from the head of the Japanese Government Japan's acceptance of military commitments equivalent to those borne by U.S. allies in the NATO bloc. We recall that the head of the White House made this demand 1 and 1/2 years ago during the visit to Washington by former Japanese Prime Minister Suzuki.

At that time, in a joint communique, relations between the U.S. and Japan were for the first time officially called an alliance. This wording places a symbol of equality between the American-Japanese security treaty and the North Atlantic Pact and in this way places the same burden of military spending on Japan as that borne by Washington's West European allies in the NATO bloc. These plans evoked sharp criticism in Japan. Political figures justifiably pointed out that they threaten to drag Japan even further into U.S. military strategy and that they run counter to the Japanese Constitution, which prohibits having an army.

As a result of this, Suzuki even had to sacrifice his foreign minister, shouldering him with the responsibility for including the wording about alliance with the United States in the communique. However, by all accounts this is what the head of the White House will again be demanding.

According to Japanese journalists, in order to placate, so to speak, the American President, Nakasone has brought with him four gifts for Washington: a decision further increasing military spending by 6 and 1/2 percent in the next fiscal year, a promise to provide the U.S. with Japanese military technology, an agreement to render $4 billion in assistance to the South Korean regime and, finally, a number of trade concessions that should ease the flow of American goods into the Japanese market.

Nakasone's readiness to provide the U.S. with the latest military technology has caused particular indignation in Japan. You can now see on the screen some of [words indistinct]. [Video shows soldiers using various military electronic equipment] Americans are particularly attracted by Japanese computers that may be used in radar guidance systems in warplanes and warships. The sale of the U.S. of military technology means backing down on Japan's previously proclaimed commitment to refrain from exporting weapons. This commitment arises from the (?peace) clauses of the Japanese Constitution and has been considered one of the basic principles of Japanese diplomacy. To violate it, according to the Japanese newspaper TOKYO SHIMBUN, would lead to a further outbreak of numerous, serious problems.

Nevertheless, even these major concessions are considered by Washington to be insufficient. They are demanding that Japan make even more military commitments and help the U.S. to a greater degree in pursuing its anti-Soviet course.

Today, when Reagan is meeting Nakasone, U.S. Army Chief of Staff Edward Meyer will set off on a trip to Hokkaido, the northernmost island of Japan. The reason for the American general's special attention to this particular area is not being kept secret. It is situated in close proximity to the Soviet border. The Pentagon pays particular attention to Japan's military measures in this region. Japanese-American maneuvers have been carried out here. The latest American F-16 fighter-bombers, which are capable of carrying nuclear weapons, will be deployed in the immediate vicinity -- in the north of Honshu Island. All these military preparations are exacerbating tension on the border with the USSR. This is what they are seeking in Washington, but this can hardly meet with the interests of Japan.

Radio Commentary

OW190001 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 17 Jan 83

[Excerpts] The Japan-U.S. summit talks between Prime Minister Nakasone and President Reagan are scheduled to begin on 18 January. In this connection, Yuriy Afonin has the following comments:

The scale of Japan's military spending will be one of the complicated issues to be discussed at the Washington talks. The United States will assume the offensive, while Japan will act on the defensive on this issue. In demanding that Japan increase its military spending, the United States has acted contrary to the generally acknowledged norms for interstate relations, and the Japanese press has termed the U.S. demand a salient act of intervention in Japan's internal affairs.

Recently, the United States has even gone so far as to make it publicly known that, with a sharp increase in Japan's military spending, the competitiveness of the Japanese commodities would be weakened, and thereby the amount of exports of Japanese goods to the U.S. market would be reduced.

At a press conference held in Tokyo on 13 January, Prime Minister Nakasone mentioned that, in addition to these issues, his talks with President Reagan would touch on East-West relations in a broader sense and also on the policy towards the Soviet Union. The Japanese side would also like to be informed of the U.S. views on SALT negotiations with the Soviet Union.

The Supreme Soviet and the CPSU Central Committee issued an appeal to parliaments, governments, political parties and the people of various countries in the world in December 1982. The appeal was handed to the Japanese Government. In it, the Soviet Union reiterated its readiness to cooperate with all countries in preventing a nuclear catastrophe. In addition, the Warsaw Pact countries recently adopted, at their Prague meeting, a Political Declaration in which extensive programs for limiting and reducing armaments, as well as for eliminating the threat of a nuclear war, were set out. These proposals were directed at the two leading powers in the capitalist world, namely, Japan and the United States.

The results of the summit talks between these two countries will have to be first judged by what approaches the two sides take toward the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe and the checking of the arms race.

TASS on Talks, Problems

LD190725 Moscow TASS in English 0715 GMT 19 Jan 83

[Text] Washington January 19 TASS -- At a White House meeting between U.S. President Ronald Reagan and Japanese Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone, on an official visit here, the sides failed to overcome their differences and decided to continue discussion despite initial plans. Ronald Reagan declared on the completion of the talks that he and Yasuhiro Nakasone discussed rather complicated problems of defense and trade.

A high-ranking American official announced on the completion of the meeting that Ronald Reagan and Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger insisted in the course of the very frank talks that Japan should take early measures to step up its military preparations. As to the decision to increase its military spending by 6.5 percent in the 1983 financial year, taken by the Japanese Government late in December under U.S. pressure, they in Washington say it is not enough.

The discussion of serious trade problems aggravating American-Japanese relations failed to produce any outcome.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA VIEWS JAPANESE MILITARY EFFORT

PM181431 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Jan 83 Second Edition p 3

[International observer V. Vinogradov's "Military Consultative Review": "Japan: Climbing the Militarization Ladder"]

[Text] At the Political Consultative Committee conference in Prague the top representatives of the Warsaw Pact states jointly examined the situation in Europe and exchanged opinions on a number of other international issues. They noted that the improvement of the world situation is connected to a considerable extent with the elimination of the existing centers of military conflicts in Asia, Africa, Latin America and other regions and the prevention of the emergence of new ones.

At the same time the conference noted the necessity to seek to obtain the solution of problems existing in a number of regions in the world, including Southeast Asia, by political means and to promote the consolidation of peace in Asia and in the Pacific Ocean region. The conference's participants stated their views and proposals in this regard in the Political Declaration which they adopted.

In the light of the conclusions drawn up by the Political Consultative Committee conference in Prague, the situation which is developing in particular in east Asia as a result of the further strengthening of the Japanese-American military alliance and the appreciably increased activity of militaristic circles in Japan itself, cannot fail to attract the public's attention.

It will be recalled that important events have recently taken place in Japan. After a year and a half of "anarchy" [bezvlastiye] the ruling Liberal Democratic Party found a new president and the country a new prime minister. On this occasion victory in Tokyo's "corridors of powers" went to Yasuhiro Nakasone who had, after all, been waiting a long time for his "golden hour" to come. He has held a seat in parliament since 1947 without a break. In 1959 he received his first ministerial portfolio and from that time on has constantly been awarded high government and party posts. Nakasone, while occupying at one time the post of Japan Defense Agency chief, showed himself to be a particularly zealous supporter of the creation of a powerful Japanese army and supporter of the strengthening of the Japanese-American military alliance and a revision of the peaceful provisions of the country's constitution. And now here he is as the head of the government.

The end of the period of "anarchy" in Tokyo has served as a signal for Washington. The United States unleashed directly on the Land of the Rising Sun a concentrated "salvo" of demands. Just a few days after Nakasone's election, D. Rumsfeld, a special envoy of the American President, arrived in Tokyo. In the course of the talks with the new prime minister Washington's emissary demanded from Japan "new efforts" to expedite militaristic preparations and to increase military appropriations. A week later U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger while giving an interview to the Japanese KYODO news agency again repeated the same demands. He stated that Washington expects from its Far East ally the swiftest execution of the armed forces intensification program, including preparation for combat operations in the Pacific Ocean within a 1,000-mile zone around Japan's coasts. The Pentagon chief emphasized that the United States "will remain satisfied" if Japan's state budget for fiscal 1983 is orientated toward the achievement of these goals.

This American pressure was brought about by the fact that the Japanese Government had to confirm the draft budget for the new fiscal year. During his meeting with S. Abe, the minister of foreign affairs, M. Mansfield, the U.S. ambassador to Japan, once again expressed Washington's patent dissatisfaction at the "insufficient efforts" of Japan in increasing militaristic preparations and demanded a "sizable increase" in military appropriations. The American Senate went still further. It unanimously passed an unprecedented resolution demanding that Tokyo sharply increase its military expenditure. In the form of an ultimatum Japan was told that henceforth it is "obliged to increase its appropriations for military purposes" each year by 10-12 percent in real terms. In addition it was demanded that Tokyo take upon itself the entire expenditure for the maintenance of the Pentagon's numerous military installations on the Japanese islands.

The overt pressure put on Japan by Washington forms part of the American plans regarding this region of the globe. J. Holdridge, assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific affairs, speaking at a press conference in the U.S. capital, stated that the United States intends to press for an expansion of its military and political hegemony in the Far East, Southeast Asia and in the western part of the Pacific Ocean. At the same time, he emphasized that Japan remains the key to American strategy in East Asia.

As early as last year the Pentagon announced its plans for the deployment of 48 new F-16 fighter-bombers capable of carrying nuclear weapons at the Air Force base at Misawa on Honshu Island. And now the U.S. military department has reported that the 7th Fleet, whose ships are based in Japanese ports, is being reinforced by the latest nuclear powered aircraft carrier, the Carl Vinson, and a modernized battleship, the New Jersey, equipped with Tomahawk cruise missiles. There are other plans too. Therefore the pressure put on Japan from across the ocean is pursuing the objective, as the U.S. NEWS and WORLD REPORT, a magazine close to Pentagon circles, pointed out, of not tolerating a refusal of support for these American plans on the part of the new government in Tokyo.

Observers are drawing attention to the fact that such overt pressure by the Americans is not receiving an appropriate rebuff from the ruling circles in Japan. But the point of the matter is that the presence of such a factor makes it easier for official Tokyo to take decisions which do not correspond to the country's national interest, but where certain circles in Japan do have an interest. Under the cover of Washington's endless demands Japan under Nakasone has already raced up several rungs of the militarization ladder.

The premier has decisively turned down the opposition parties' demand for a reduction of military expenditure and an increase in appropriations for social needs. During the meetings that took place with the leaders of these parties on the eve of the confirmation of the new draft state budget, Nakasone declared to them that in his opinion the planned increase of 5.5 percent in Japan's military expenditure constituted the "minimum necessary amount" for ensuring the country's defense.

Japan's military expenditure in fiscal 1983 (beginning 1 April) amounts to a postwar record sum of 2,754 trillion yen (approximately $11.5 billion). This means that the "minimum necessary amount" earmarked for the Defense Agency's disposal is increased not by 5.5 percent as Nakasone promised, but by 6.5 percent straightaway. What is more, according to Tokyo newspaper reports, such an increase in the military budget was made on the prime minister's direct instruction.

By all appearances the escalation of militaristic preparations in Japan in the very near future will be elevated to a still higher level. As the newspaper MAINICHI reported, the Defense Agency has set about the "specific study of the question" of the revocation of the position established earlier by official Tokyo on limiting of "self-defense" appropriations to 1 percent of GNP. There is no doubt that the revocation of such a limitation will mean a still swifter growth in the funds put at the disposal of the military, whose militaristic appetites know no bounds. After all, in terms of the size of its military expenditure Japan at the present time is already abreast of the majority of NATO countries.

As the newspaper TOKYO SHIMBUN reported, in Prime Minister Nakasone's opinion, Japan can provide the United States with any modern military technology that it has. A conference was held in Tokyo of the country's ministries and departments involved at which the prime minister's opinion was put into shape as an official decision.

The resolution of the conference's participants signed by the head of government and by ministry chiefs claims that "Japan's contribution to the buildup of the U.S. Armed Forces' might by means of the granting of the latest military technology to the United States is essential for the maintenance of the security treaty between the two countries." It is a question of military technology where Japan has been able to outstrip the United States and which the Pentagon needs for the creation of the latest missile-guidance systems, air defense and antisubmarine defense. And the fact that Japan is ready to grant this technology even if the United States finds itself involved in direct armed conflict, the newspaper AKAHATA emphasizes, means that Japan can find itself participating in any Pentagon global adventure.

Japan's next 5-year military program, for 1983-1987, is also aimed at the country's further militarization. The main attention in it, as demanded by the Pentagon, is given to the provision of the Air Force and Navy with the latest military equipment. The Air and Navy "Self-Defense" Forces are to receive P-3C Orion antisubmarine aircraft and the latest F-15 Eagle fighters, AWACS-equipped aircraft, and helicopters, destroyers and minesweepers, submarines and helicopter carriers. The Japan Defense Agency leadership has already started carrying out certain of the provisions of the new military program without waiting for it to come officially into force. The naval air force is already being equipped with the P-3C aircraft and Japan's Air Force command announced on the eve of the New Year that the formation of the first squadron of "new generation" aircraft at the (Nyu Tabaru) Air Base has been completed ahead of schedule. Some 20 American-produced F-15 fighters make up its strength. The second squadron of aircraft of the same type will be formed this very year at the Chitose Air Base.

According to a KYODO news agency report, the carrying out "in full" of the 5-year military program estimated at 16 trillion yen will put Japan into first place among states which do not possess nuclear weapons. And this means that once again there is beginning to loom over Asia the dangerous shadow of a state which has already in the past used its military might against a number of Asian states. This is why the countries of Southeast Asia are very alarmed by the gathering momentum of Japan's militarization process and by the U.S. endeavors not only to accelerate this process but also to place on the Japanese military the functions of gendarme in that part of the globe.

The statement by F. Marcos, is indicative in this respect. He opposed the strengthening of Japan's military might on such a scale "since it is already beginning to represent a threat to us minor Southeast Asian states." Marcos made it known that if Japan's re-armament gathers pace it will then be difficult to stop it. The same opinion is also held by Indonesian President Suharto.

The only way to reassure the alarmed public opinion of the Asian countries would be for Tokyo to renounce the dangerous course directed at the buildup of military might and military preparations and at the broadening of the military alliance with the United States. The carrying out of a policy of remilitarization and the obvious endeavors of Japan's ruling forces to play up to the American Administration's hegemonist plans and even participate in them pose a direct threat to peace and security in the Far East. This also runs contrary to the national interests of Japan itself.

JAPAN-USSR TRADE, ECONOMIC RELATIONS DISCUSSED

OW170643 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 15 Jan 83

[Sergey Alekseyev commentary]

[Text] The year 1982 was a difficult year for Soviet-Japanese relations. First there was the increasing tendency to make a political issue out of economic relations between the two countries. The Japanese Government (?once again) supported the U.S. Government when it adopted other sanctions against the Soviet Union. However, this policy of sanctions against the Soviet Union proved to be unpopular among Western business circles, including the one in Japan. The Reagan administration therefore had to withdraw a number of trade bans soon after it had imposed them last summer. Nevertheless, the Japanese ruling circles still remain loyal to this policy, to the detriment of the overall atmosphere of Soviet-Japanese relations.

Second, the setbacks in the Japanese economy have had an adverse effect on expanding Soviet exports to Japan. Japan drastically reduced its traditional fuel and raw material imports, including those from the Soviet Union. In spite of this, the total trade volume between Japan and the Soviet Union increased by about 10 percent in value to $6 billion in 1982. Considering the fact that the total volume of Japanese trade with its major trade partners, such as the United States, the EC, Southeast Asian countries and China, decreased in 1982, we cannot but pay attention to the (?increase) in Soviet-Japanese trade. From this we draw the conclusion that when the two sides are interested in developing their trade and economic cooperation, they will be able to surmount any arbitrary obstacles and produce good results even if there are some unfavorable conditions.

The Soviet Union is confident that the potential for developing its trade and economic relations with Japan has not diminished at all.

This conviction is based on our rich experience in the 1970's and the objective factor of the potential resources of the two countries. It goes without saying that we have to take obstacles into consideration. But obstacles are not a decisive factor.

There are some concrete examples which show that Soviet-Japanese exchanges have become active in the field of trade. Late last year the negotiations on Japanese plant exports to the Soviet Union were resumed after they had been suspended for 1 and 1/2 years. In addition, the negotiations between Japan and the Soviet Union on exporting large diameter Japanese steel pipes, a major trade item between the two countries, to the Soviet Union in 1983 were successfully concluded.

We can only say that these were important developments. The Japanese steelmakers agreed to provide a credit to the Soviet Union to finance this transaction on far more favorable terms for the Soviet side than any the export-import bank could offer. This is the second time such a favorable credit has been made available.

The Japanese business circles pin much hope on the development of economic relations between the two countries. Recently ASAHI SHIMBUN pointed that out when it commented on reports that a mammoth Japanese economic delegation headed by Shigeo Nagano, chairman of the Japan-USSR economic committee, would visit the Soviet Union in February. The delegation will include more than 150 members. This will be the largest Japanese business delegation to visit the Soviet Union in 3 years. In addition, Yoshihiro Inayama, chairman of the Japan federation of economic organizations, will also visit the Soviet Union.

The two sides have many things to talk about. For instance, Japan is behind other advanced capitalist countries in certain trade areas with the Soviet Union. Because of Japan's support for the U.S. Government's anti-Soviet policy, anti-Soviet sanctions above all else, the increase in Japanese-Soviet trade has markedly slowed down in recent years. Japan has yielded its position as the Soviet Union's top trade partner. This cannot be squared with the potential of the Japanese economy.

The time has come for the Soviet Union and Japan to discuss the question of stepping up economic cooperation in developing natural resources in the eastern part of the Soviet Union. It was 3 years ago that a project was worked out to study the feasibility of such cooperation in developing the Udokan copper mine and build a pulp-paper complex. Recently, ASAHI SHIMBUN said that providing economic cooperation to the Soviet Union the development of Siberia, above all, is indispensable to solving Japan's fuel problems.

To be sure, there are good prospects for economic exchanges between the Soviet Union and Japan. The main question is how to translate this prospect into reality as soon as possible.

The Soviet Union has always endeavored to promote mutually beneficial economic cooperation with interested nations. This kind of cooperation is an effective means of strengthening a policy of peace and good-neighborliness. We wish to see again a true desire on the part of Japan for steppping up and developing mutually beneficial contacts with the Soviet Union and wish to see it take realistic steps toward that end.

GROMYKO, WEST GERMANS CONCLUDE OFFICIAL TALKS

Talks with Kohl, Other Activities

LD181848 Moscow TASS in English 1803 GMT 18 Jan 83

[Text] Bonn January 18 TASS -- Andrey Gromyko, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, has conferred with West German Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl today.

In the course of their businesslike and frank conversation particular attention was paid to the problem of limiting nuclear weapons in Europe. Andrey Gromyko stressed that the Soviet Union was prepared to agree to a radical reduction in the European zone of its medium-range nuclear systems, including the most up-to-date missiles, to the levels not exceeding the corresponding weapons of states participating in the North Atlantic alliance, of which both Britain and France are members.

The Soviet Union, Andrey Gromyko said, is doing everything that depends on it to achieve a fair agreement on this question which would not prejudice the security of either side. The USSR stands for maintaining the existing balance of forces at the lowest possible level but it will not allow anyone to upset this balance.

The Soviet side again pointed out the unrealistic character of the so-called "zero option" put forward and stubbornly upheld by Washington, the implementation of which would mean the unilateral disarmament of the USSR. Having put forward such a proposal, obviously unacceptable to the other side, the United States would like to deadlock the Geneva talks and thus to ensure the deployment of new American missiles in Western Europe.

The hope was expressed that West Germany would use the possibilities available to it to contribute to a breakthrough at the Soviet-American talks and to their successful completion. In this connection the chancellor's attention was drawn to the fact that it is necessary for the successes of the talks to rid them of any pressure, including the fixation of a rigid timeframe for them.

The federal chancellor stressed the importance and timeliness of the new initiatives put forward by the Warsaw Treaty countries in the Political Declaration approved in Prague on January 5. He also stated that West Germany had an interest in the productive outcome of the talks between the Soviet Union and the United States in Geneva on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe. At the same time he stated the well-known position of West Germany, which actually amounts to support for the U.S. Administration's line on this matter.

Andrey Gromyko and Helmut Kohl spoke in favour of the strict observance of the treaties and agreements concluded between the USSR and West Germany and of filling them with concrete content in future as well. They stressed the importance of the further development of stable relations between the two countries and their mutually beneficial constructive cooperation, which are a substantial factor of stability on the European Continent.

Andrey Gromyko also conferred with Franz-Josef Strauss, chairman of the Christian Social Union, discussing certain outstanding problems of development in the world and in Europe, and also different aspects of bilateral relations between the USSR and West Germany.

On the same day Andrey Gromyko gave a luncheon in honour of Hans-Dietrich Genscher, deputy federal chancellor and minister of foreign affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany.

18 Jan Press Conference

LD181536 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 18 Jan 83

[From the Vremya newscast; film shows Gromyko speaking at news conference]

[Text] Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko held a news conference today. Speaking to journalists, he said:

[Begin Gromyko recording] The first thing I would like to say is that not only the Soviet Union but also the Federal Republic of Germany appraise positively everything that has been achieved previously in the development of relations between them. The conclusion of the political treaty between the FRG and the Soviet Union was of great importance. This treaty has worked well, for the good of the two countries. And not only for the two countries' good, but for the good of all peoples of Europe and for the international situation as a whole. It has worked not at all badly [sovsem neplokho].

Further on bilateral relations, I must state, with satisfaction, that the state leadership of the Federal Republic of Germany, just like the Soviet leadership, intends to continue to act on the basis of the treaty -- that is, to develop, deepen and enrich relations between them. This concerns politics, the economy, trade and scientific-technological cooperation, cultural ties and ties in other spheres. If this line in relations is maintained on the part of the FRG, we can look to the future of these relations optimistically, because the same course will be conducted on our part regarding the FRG, the course of development of these relations, the course of good relations. We would like the Federal Republic of Germany, in building its relations with the Soviet Union, to express its own personality, to be guided by its own attitudes, to be guided by its own interests, and not to listen to external influences if they are not in accord with those interests and with the interests of maintaining good relations with the Soviet Union. Do not think that we have here any kind of bad intentions, bad intentions in the sense that we wish to see the spoiling of relations between the FRG and certain other countries. No, we have no such intentions, they are not present.

Of course, certain international problems have been the subject of discussion, including problems concerning Europe. Moreover, one can probably say that chief attention was devoted among them to problems of European security, and it is well known why. Both the Federal Republic of Germany and the Soviet Union live in one European house, under one roof. Neither side can fail to be interested in what kind of situation exists in Europe, or what kind of situation might come about. Moreover, neither side can fail to be interested in the international situation as a whole, in the direction in which it is developing. What can one say about the exchange of opinions on this circle of problems? One can say, with satisfaction, that the opinion was expressed on both sides that it is peace, peace and security, that is in accord with the interests of the peoples of both the Federal Republic of Germany and the Soviet Union, and of other states both in Europe and outside Europe. We were very impressed by the thoughts that were expressed in favor of peace and in favor of detente.

My final question -- perhaps I am revealing a secret to you to some extent, but I hope, all the same, there will be no reproach made against me on the party of Chancellor Kohl because of this -- so, the final question for me is whether, on my arrival in Moscow, I can say firmly to the whole Soviet leadership and to Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, the general secretary, personally, that the FRG leadership is for detente, for the course which marked the previous, prolonged period of development of relations between the two countries. I received an affirmative answer; one can say that this course will remain in force.

If I had not told you, you would probably have guessed for yourselves that among the problems on which there was an exchange of opinions -- I have international problems in mind -- there figured the problem of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe and that of strategic nuclear weapons. These problems are very complex. If you were all to be examined on your knowledge of the details of these problems, I am not certain that you would all get the highest marks. Let us say, five out of five. But this does not at all mean that the policy on these problems should not be clear. In general terms, I would like to say on the first question, regarding medium-range weapons in Europe: There are points of contact between the positions of the Federal Republic of Germany and of the Soviet Union. But there are also differences between our positions.

If I said that these differences and divergence of opinion have been overcome, this would be an exaggeration. And, of course, it is necessary to continue the dialogue, consultations, talks, give them any name you like, but this necessity exists and will continue.

I would answer in a similar way if I was asked: Well, what is the situation and what can be said about the exchange of views on the issue of strategic nuclear armaments on a global scale? Between our positions there are points of contact but of course there are also divergences. Here too there is a need to continue the dialgoue, the consultations and talks on this issue too. Both sides are prepared to continue the exchange of views, the talks and dialogue. This was declared by the West German side and this was also declared by our side. We came here not with the purpose of defending any single party nor of abusing the policies and views of any single party. This was not the purpose. We came here in order to explain our policies and to support such existing or potential policies in West Germany and such elements and aspects of policies which correspond to a stance for good relations between the FRG and the Soviet Union, to a stance for peace, for detente and disarmament. This is what we came here for. [end recording]

Then Comrade Gromyko answered questions asked him by journalists.

Remarks on Arms Issues

LD181512 Hamburg DPA in German 1423 GMT 18 Jan 83

[Excerpts] Bonn, 18 Jan (DPA) -- The Soviet Union sees no progress at all so far at the Geneva missile talks with the United States and places the responsibility for this solely with Washington. Optimistic assessments of the talks, put out by the U.S. Administration, were "hardly justified", Soviet Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko said in Bonn today. Speaking at an international press conference, Gromyko at the same time expressed satisfaction at the fact that Helmut Kohl's government, like Moscow, is ready to "further develop, strengthen and enrich" mutual relations on the basis of the 1970 treaty.

Gromyko, who last night at an official dinner issued a strong warning of the consequences of any NATO "counterarming" with medium-range weapons and said that in this event new Soviet missiles would be set up, again emphatically rejected before journalists the "zero option" proposed by the United States. The USSR would "on no account accept" this proposal (a renunciation of NATO counterarming in return for dismantlement of Soviet systems) because this would break the existing balance. NATO would then have double the number of carrier systems and three times as many nuclear warheads as the Soviet Union. "Anyone who puts such proposals on the table is not serious."

The Soviet foreign minister underlined Moscow's proposal to limit the number of Soviet medium-range weapons to the corresponding combined potential of France and Great Britain. Referring to Western objections that these two countries are not participating in the Geneva talks, Gromyko pointed out these two countries' clear membership with their nuclear arsenals in the Western alliance.

The missiles of these states could reach the territory of the USSR and its allies. It is not acceptable for these weapon systems to be simply ignored, especially as Moscow is not demanding any reduction in these weapon stocks. There are governments even in NATO which share Moscow's point of view.

Gromyko appealed strongly to the United States to show more flexibility both in the talks on intercontinental missiles (START) and on medium-range systems (INF) in Geneva. So far Washington's proposals have only been geared to U.S. superiority. In the case of the START negotiations, the U.S. demands are even designed to prevent any settlement. Gromyko gave his assurance that the Soviet Union does not want any superiority. "A balance of weapons and equal security are the most sacred principle as far as we are concerned." Gromyko denied reports that the USSR and United States were close to a compromise at the INF talks last summer. "This is a rumor and does not correspond at all with the truth," he said.

During the almost 2-hour meeting between Gromyko and the federal chancellor, the question "which especially concerns us" of the emigration of Germans from the USSR was also discussed, according to Kohl. In addition, intra-German relations as well as the "continuing unsatisfactory situation in Poland and Afghanistan" were discussed, Kohl said today at a meeting in Hanover. The chancellor said that he had received specific answers from Gromyko on a number of questions regarding the recent disarmament proposals by Soviet party leader Yuriy Andropov and would brief the United States on these. He underlined that Bonn supports the U.S. negotiating goal (zero option) because "the unilateral threat from the Soviet SS-20 missiles is not acceptable to us." Contrary to the SPD, [Social Democratic Party] the union is not prepared to accept these missiles.

Kohl described Geran-Soviet relations as a central issue of the Federal Government's foreign policy. Bonn and all its partners want a more constructive, better relationship with Moscow. That is why the Federal Government supports dialogue, cooperation and detente whereby agreement must be reached as to "what both sides understand by detente". He also advocated to Gromyko a "well prepared" summit meeting between U.S. President Ronald Reagan and General Secretary Andropov, which could give important impetus to the talks in Geneva.

The Soviet foreign minister, who stressed to the press in Bonn his country's desire for good relations with the United States, expressed his approval in principle of such a meeting. He does not think, however, that the U.S. Administration has the real will to start the necessary preparations for this. The USSR is not in a position to have to beg for this meeting "with outstretched hand." Asked about the situation in Poland, Gromyko said that this country should be left in peace. The issues there are the internal affair of the Poles. No one has the right to interfere there -- "neither the West, nor the East, nor the North, nor the South."

Gromyko, who before his departure on Wednesday is also to meet party chairmen Willy Brandt (SPD) and Franz-Josef Strauss (CSU) [Christian Social Union] and also SPD chancellor candidate Hans-Jochen Vogel, made it clear that in no way does he want to touch upon internal political German interests in Bonn prior to the elections. He did not speak "for or against any party." He was concerned to explain Soviet policy and to support the elements in German policy which aim for good-neighborly relations, the preservation of peace, detente and disarmament.

Meets With SPD's Brandt

LD181828 Moscow TASS in English 1756 GMT 18 Jan 83

[Text] Bonn January 18 TASS -- Andrey Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, had a meeting with Willy Brandt, chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany.

They had an exchange of views concerning first of all an end to the arms race, and the strengthening of peace. Serious attention was given to the Soviet Union's new proposals on limiting nuclear weapons, including medium-range missile weapons in Europe, as well as to the initiatives of the Political Consultative Committee (PCC) of the Warsaw Treaty member-states, initiatives put forward at the PCC's recent meeting in Prague.

Andrey Gromyko expressed hope that the SDP [Social Democratic Party] will make its contribution to finding such solutions which would facilitate restraining the arms race and preventing a nuclear war.

Willy Brant noted the constructive character of the proposals of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, and stated that the SDP is in favour of the proposals to be considered in all seriousness by the governments of Western countries, including the FRG.

Emphasized on both sides was an urgent need to preserve and further multiply everything positive that has been achieved since the beginning of the seventies in relations between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany on the firm foundation of the Moscow Treaty and other existing agreements.

Communist Party Leader Mies

LD191056 Moscow TASS in English 0952 GMT 19 Jan 83

[Text] Bonn January 19 TASS -- Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR Andrey Gromyko had a meeting here today with the chairman of the German Communist Party [CPG] Herbert Mies. The meeting passed in a heartfelt, friendly atmosphere and confirmed the identity of views between the CPSU and the GCP on the cardinal questions of the development of the international situation, including the situation in Europe.

SPD Chancellor Candidate Vogel

LD191132 Moscow TASS in English 1115 GMT 19 Jan 83

[Text] Bonn January 19 TASS -- Andrey Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, had a conversation here with Hans-Jochen Vogel, member of the Presidium of the Board of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, the party's candidate for chancellor.

They dwelt on fundamental questions of bilateral relations between the USSR and the FRG, and also on problems of ensuring peace and security in Europe.

Andrey Gromyko stressed that the Soviet Union views as the key task the prevention of a new round of the arms race in Europe and the attainment of arms limitation and reduction. In this context he evaluated the state of affairs at the Soviet-American talks on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe. It was stressed that the proposals set forth by the Soviet Union at these talks provide a possibility for finding a mutually acceptable accord that would ensure a substantial lowering of the level of nuclear confrontation, and make peace in the continent and in the whole world stronger.

Hans-Jochen Vogel stated that his recent trip to Moscow, and first of all the detailed conversation with the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Yuriy Andropov, had enabled him to get the fullest idea of the Soviet Union's approach to the problem of limiting nuclear arms in Europe and to appreciate the importance of the new Soviet proposals on this matter.

It was noted from both sides that a further development of goodneighbourly relations between the USSR and the FRG on the reliable foundation of the Moscow Treaty, the expansion of mutually advantageous business cooperation between them would accord with the interests of the peoples of both countries, and serve the cause of peace in Europe and in the whole world.

Final Talks Held

LD191256 Moscow TASS in English 1248 GMT 19 Jan 83

[Text] Bonn January 19 TASS -- Andrey Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, who is on an official visit here at the invitation of the FRG Government, had a brief concluding conversation today with deputy federal chancellor, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the FRG Hans-Dietrich Genscher. It was agreed that the sides will continue the exchange of views at various levels on questions of interest to them.

Later in the day Andrey Gromyko left Bonn. At the airport he was seen off by Hans-Dietrich Genscher and other officials.

The send-off party included the USSR Ambassador in the FRG Vladimir Semenov.

Departs for GDR

LD191318 Hamburg DPA in German 1303 GMT 19 Jan 83

[Text] Bonn, 19 Jan (DPA) -- Soviet Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko ended his 4-day visit to Bonn on Wednesday. He flew on to East Berlin.

Gromyko, who held final political talks on Wednesday morning with Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher and SPD [Socialist Democratic Party] candidate for chancellor Hans-Jochen Vogel, was accompanied to the gangway of the special Soviet Ilyushin-62 by Genscher at Cologne-Bonn Airport.

Moscow Radio Assesses Visit

DW182114 Moscow in German to Germany 1700 GMT 17 Jan 83

[Valentin Sakharov commentary: "Andrey Gromyko's FRG Visit"]

[Text] Esteemed ladies and gentlemen, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko, who is now visiting the FRG, began his political exchange of views with the Federal Government on Monday. Thus the Federal Government is the first Western government with which Andrey Gromyko is holidng political talks this year.

As is known, the two sides during the past few weeks have expressed their will for continuity on the basis of the treaties. Thus what matters is continuity in the will for cooperation. Commensurate with this, Andrey Gromyko emphasized at the beginning of his visit to the FRG that now as before the Soviet Union views the future of Soviet-West German relations in the light of peaceful coexistence and cooperation instead of enmity and hatred. To be sure, Andrey Gromyko said, we expect a similar approach from the FRG.

Upon his arrival in Bonn, Andrey Gromyko expressed the expectation that utmost attention will be devoted in the political exchange of views with the Federal Government to the cardinal issue of our times which reads: How can the dangerous arms race with atomic weapons in Europe be prevented and peace on our continent be made more secure?

The Soviet Union is of the view that the efforts of all European states must be directed toward the solution of this task.

Hence the FRG, too, must not be missing in this respect, for Soviet-FRG cooperation on solving the aforementioned task could only serve the FRG's national interests and carry quite a lot of weight for the situation in Europe and in the world. Thus it becomes evident that it is in the very interest of the FRG to counter any aggravation of the international situation in Europe. The task to prevent the nuclear arms race in Europe and to make peace more secure implies the conclusion that normal relations, let alone good-neighborly relations between East and West in Europe, cannot prosper in the shadow of new American medium-range missiles.

The Soviet Union and the other countries of the Warsaw Treaty have submitted proposals for disarament in the field of medium-range weapons and for the conclusion of a treaty on the nonuse of force with the NATO countries. What the Soviet Union proposed for disarmament in the field of medium-range weapons is that the Soviet Union keep exactly the number of such missiles with this range as exists on NATO's side, meaning on the side of Britain and France, and that it keeps exactly as many medium-range aircraft carrying nuclear weapons as the United States, Britain and France possess together. By the same token the Soviet Union has stressed that it was ready for the total liberation of the continent from medium-range as well as tactical weapons.

What must be said in this connection is that the Reagan administration's so-called zero solution in the field of medium-range missiles is unacceptable, because the U.S. negotiating position in Geneva is linked with the refusal of taking into account also the British and French medium-range missiles. The U.S. efforts at leaving the medium-range missiles of Britain and France out of consideration is -- as is obvious -- an attempt at obtruding a treaty on the Soviet Union which is aimed at NATO's superiority. This is why the assumption to expect the Soviet Union of going down to zero with its medium-range missiles is completely unrealistic.

Apart from the Soviet Union's proposals on disarmament in the field of medium-range weapons, also the offer of the Warsaw Treaty countries concerning the conclusion of a treaty on the nonuse of force between the member-states of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO is an extremely important initiative by the socialist countries for the preservation and securing of peace in Europe. One of the central points of this treaty could be -- as the socialist countries propose -- the joint commitment by the member-states of the Warsaw treaty and NATO of not being the first to use atomic or conventional weapons and military force against one another.

Thus what the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries propose is to create security in Europe through cooperation. These countries consider security a political task and this is what is now the focus of the exchange of views between Soviet and FRG politicians in Bonn.

Dinner Speech Comparison

Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2112 GMT on 17 January reports the speech made by USSR Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko at a dinner in Bonn on 17 January. This report has been compared with the Moscow TASS English item published in the 17 January **Soviet Union DAILY REPORT**, pages G 3 through G 6, and was found to be identical with the following exceptions:

Paragraph 5, line 4, page G 3 the Moscow TASS Russian item reads: ...geographical vicinity, the specific aspects of the economic...(rewording the passage)

Paragraph 7, line 4, page G 4 the Moscow TASS Russian item reads:

...with the FRG at the moment.

Detente, which so...(supplying additional words)

Paragraph 8, line 4, page G 5 the Moscow TASS Russian item reads:

...level and thoroughly verified. We want Europe...(rewording passage)

TASS CITES BRANDT ON ANDROPOV PEACE PROPOSALS

LD181834 Moscow TASS in English 1744 GMT 18 Jan 83

[Text] Bonn January 18 TASS -- The proposals of Yuriy Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on the limitation and reduction of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe "are weighty proposals," Willy Brandt, chairman of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany, has stressed in an interview given to the weekly VORWAERTS. The text of the interview has been released by the press service of the Social-Democratic Party in Bonn today. According to Willy Brandt, the Soviet proposals "are a contribution to the further discussion of this complex problem." They "testify to readiness for serious talks" and "cannot be disregarded," Willy Brandt has stated.

BRITISH PILOT TRIED FOR SHOOTING DOWN PLANE

LD150828 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 15 Jan 83

[Text] At a British air base in West Germany a military tribunal has examined a case of a British pilot who shot down another fighter plane involved in exercises in the course of his practice flight. At the trial the pilot said he had forgotten that his Phantom was equipped with a Sidewinder rocket. Besides, he said, warning lights on the control panel failed to appear. Investigations confirm that in fact not enough measures are taken in the course of military exercises to prevent tragic incidents.

The public in Britain and in West Germany where the incident took place, is concerned over the possibility that dangerous incidents with missiles might entail serious international repercussions.

AUSTRIAN FOREIGN MINISTER CALLS FOR DISARMAMENT

LD181838 Moscow TASS in English 1832 GMT 18 Jan 83

[Text] Vienna January 18 TASS -- Austrian Foreign Minister Willibald Pahr has called for effective disarmament measures. Today, he said answering a question in parliament, disarmament is no longer a matter concerning individual states or groups of states. The issue of disarmament concerns all, including neutral Austria. Never before has the world had such destructive weapons as have been stockpiled today. Never before have so huge sums been spent on developing new weapons systems as are being spent today.

Austria, Willibald Pahr emphasised, will continue to make a contribution of its own to creating an atmosphere of trust between states and to promoting the cause of disarmament.

USSR DELEGATION REPORTEDLY TO VISIT LEBANON 19 JAN

LD182050 Algiers Voice of Palestine in Arabic 1700 GMT 18 Jan 83

[Text] It was officially announced in Beirut at noon today that a Soviet delegation, led by Akimov, member of the Supreme Soviet [name and title as heard] will arrive in Beirut on 19 January on a visit to Lebanon. The official sources did not mention the purpose of the visit of the Soviet delegation to Lebanon but it is expected that the delegation will meet with senior Lebanese officials to familiarize itself with the current situation in Lebanon in light of the program of the current Lebanese-Zionist talks.

CPSU DELEGATION DEPARTS FOR SYRIA 14 JAN

PM181227 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jan 83 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Delegation's Departure"]

[Text] A delegation of CPSU party workers headed by T.K. Malbakhov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Kabardino-Balkar CPSU Obkom, left Moscow for Damascus on 14 January in accordance with the plan for ties between the CPSU and the Syrian Ba'th Party.

TASS NOTES UNIFIL EXTENSION, SOVIET ENVOY COMMENT

LD190552 Moscow TASS in English 0500 GMT 19 Jan 83

[Text] New York January 19 TASS -- The U.N. Security Council has prolonged by another six months, till July 19, 1983, the mandate of the U.N. Interim Force in Lebanon [UNIFIL].

The present mandate of the interim force has been preserved despite the stubborn pressure brought to bear on the members of the U.N. Security Council by the USA and Israel, which were trying to achieve a change in its status and adapt it to the attainment of American and Israel's selfish aims on the Lebanese soil.

Soviet Representative R.S. Ovinnikov said that the problem of Lebanon, which has emerged as a result of the large-scale Israeli aggression against that country, remains unsettled and a considerable part of Lebanese territory remains, as before, under the Israeli occupation. The crimes of the Israeli occupiers on Lebanon's territory, the unexampled cynicism with which they disregarded the units of the Interim Force and U.N. observers became possible only because of the all-round aid and support to Israel by its "strategic partner" and patron -- the USA. The United States lavishly supplies the aggressor with weapons and ensures for it political and diplomatic cover.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA INTERVIEWS LEBANESE PREMIER

LD190756 Moscow TASS in English 0741 GMT 19 Jan 83

["To Restore Lebanon's Sovereignty" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow January 19 TASS -- Lebanon is now gripped by an acute crisis which has shattered the foundations of its existence and threatens the country's territorial integrity, Lebanon's Prime Minister Shafiq al-Wazzan has told the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. In addition to all the difficulties experienced by the nation, he said, there is an Israeli occupation which has aggravated the entire set of explosive problems.

"Under these conditions, our top priority task is the restoration of sovereignty over the entire territory of the country and an end of the Israeli occupation with a subsequent full withdrawal of all non-Lebanese forces, which will make it possible to take up the path of national revival."

"Any unbiased observer cannot fail to note the active efforts which we are applying at the talks with Israel to resolve the most urgent task -- to put an end to the Israeli occupation," Shafiq al-Wazzan said. "An outside plot is the main cause of the continuing Lebanese crisis. Our country had been involved into an orbit of dangerous struggle and confrontation, for which it paid a heavy price."

"Lebanon has become the main country opposed to Israel, having the least possibilities for that," the Lebanese prime minister went on. "Firmly sticking to the all-Arab orientation, we put forward demands for a common strategy in order to remove the threat facing us. But our appeal, however, was not put into life. As a result there emerged a situation when Lebanon became a victim of aggression and was subjected to humiliation. It is now necessary to apply every effort to get rid of this nightmare. We hope that fraternal Arab countries will promote this in all ways. Besides, in our view, all the peace-loving forces should render support for Lebanon, a small country which now carries the heavy burden of the occupation. If Lebanon's sovereignty is fully restored, Shafiq al-Wazzan pointed out, "our state will be able to ensure its independence and territorial integrity."

"I stress once again: The Lebanese problem calls for intensification of the efforts of the entire world community so that our country could receive a chance to return to normal life and the role which it had played both in the region and in the international arena."

ARAB MEDIA WELCOME 'ARAFAT MOSCOW TALKS

PM181141 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jan 83 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Firm Support"]

[Text] 14 Jan -- The results of the official friendly visit to the USSR by the PLO delegation headed by Y. 'Arafat, chairman of the PLO Executive Committee, its friendly meeting with the Soviet leaders and the Soviet-Palestinian joint communique have generated widespread response in the world. Foreign mass media stress the great significance of the talks in Moscow for the cause of attaining genuine peace in the Near East and a just solution to the Palestinian problem in the context of an all-embracing Near East settlement.

The Palestinian WAFA agency calls the friendly meeting in Moscow an historic one. The PLO delegation's trip to the USSR, the agency stresses, took place under the sign of militant fraternal cooperation. The Soviet Union reasserted most resolutely its support for the Palestinian people's struggle for the implementation of their inalienable rights and the establishment of a just peace in the Near East.

Algeria's APS agency reports: The Soviet Union firmly supports the Palestinians' right to self-determiniation and the creation of their own independent state. In the opinion of the PLO Executive Committee chairman, the United States has no intention of promoting a just Near East settlement, for the recent U.S. plan disregards the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

The Soviet position on the Palestinian problem and a Near East settlement remains a principled position, the Lebanese newspaper AN-NID'A stresses. The USSR firmly and consistently comes out in support of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples struggling for national liberation, independence and sovereignty and for the Arab territories' liberation from the Israeli occupiers.

The USSR and the PLO demand an end to the Israeli aggression in Lebanon, the immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from the entire territory of Lebanon in accordance with Security Council resolutions, and the normalization of the situation in that country on the basis of its unity, territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty.

The real culprit in the tragedy of the Palestintians and other Arab peoples who have fallen victim to Israel's aggressive expansionist policy, the Beirut newspaper ASH-SHA'B notes, is the United States, which presented Tel Aviv with modern means of mass annihilation. Washington and Israel are now acting in unison in an attempt to impose capitulationist terms on Lebanon. While the Soviet Union is tirelessly seeking an all-embracing, just Near East settlement, the United States is seeeking to weaken the unity of the Arab countries, to undermine the positions of progressive states in the region and to expand its military presence in the Near East.

The Soviet Union and the PLO resolutely denounced the U.S. position of giving Israel comprehensive aid and support, Baghdad radio reported. They spoke of the need to continue the struggle to create an independent Palestinian state.

As was clearly stated in Moscow, the Jordanian newspaper AR-RA'Y points out, a practical path toward attaining a genuine settlement would be opened up by the convening of an international conference on the Near East with the imperative participation of the PLO. The Soviet Union supports the Arabs' efforts to ensure a just and all-embracing peace in the Near East. At the Moscow meeting, the newspaper continues, on behalf of the Arab people of Palestine, Y. 'Arafat expressed profound thanks to the Soviet Union for its constant selfless aid to the Palestinians and its support for their just struggle.

The Soviet Union and the PLO expressed the determination to struggle for an all-embracing settlement in the Near East, an essential condition for which must be the unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, Kuwait's KUNA news agency reports. Those taking part in the talks in Moscow noted the virtual agreement of the Soviet proposals for a Near East settlement with the plan for such a settlement adopted at the pan-Arab conference in Fes.

The Tunisian newspaper LA PRESSE DE TUNISIE, giving a high assessment of the results of the Moscow talks, draws special attention to the USSR's firm, unshakable support for the just struggle of the Arab people of Palestine to create their own independent state.

The Soviet Union has again stated clearly that coordinated efforts are needed for an all-embracing settlement of the Near East conflict, the Hungarian newspaper NEPSZABADSAG stresses. Without the settlement of the Palestinian question long-lasting peace in the Near East is impossible.

IZVESTIYA NOTES AN-NASIR BIRTH, USSR-AIDED PROJECTS

PM181603 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Jan 83 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report from the "World Today" feature by S. Agafonov and V. Mikheyev: "Egypt: In Memory of First President"]

[Text] On 15 January Egyptian progressive forces celebrated a notable date -- the 65th anniversary of the birth of republican Egypt's first president -- J. 'Abd an-Nasir -- with whose name the most glorious pages in the country's modern history are linked, TASS reports.

During his tenure dozens of industrial enterprises were constructed in the country with the USSR's economic and technical assistance. Projects like the Aswan Dam complex, the Helwan metallurgical combine or the aluminum plant in Naj' Hammadi remain, in the opinion of Egyptian specialists, flagships of the Egyptian national economy.

RSA 'PUPPET ADMINISTRATION' IN NAMIBIA FALLS

LD150136 Moscow in Zulu to Southern Africa 1800 GMT 11 Jan 83

[Text] The head of the puppet administration in Namibia, Mr Dirk Mudge, has announced his resignation. This means that the South Africa-sponsored administration has fallen. Observers say there has been quarrels between the South African administration and the puppet government. We should always remember that the organization that truly represents the people of Namibia is the South-West African People's Organization.

NUJOMA: 'SWAPO WILL CONTINUE THE STRUGGLE'

PM181545 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Jan 83 Morning Edition p 5

[Correspondent S. Nikonov "IZVESTIYA Interview" with Sam Nujoma, president of the South West African People's Organization: "Namibia Will Be Free!"]

[Text] What was noteworthy about 1982 for the Namibian people who are struggling for their motherland's independence and against the South African occupiers? This question is answered for S. Nikonov, our Luanda correspondent, by Sam Nujoma, president of the South West African People's Organization [SWAPO].

"The past year was noteworthy for the intensification of our people's national liberation struggle against imperialism, neocolonialism and racism represented in the most loathsome form by South Africa's apartheid regime. The confidence has strengthened still further among Namibia's population that the South African occupiers will be expelled from our long-suffering land. Victory is guaranteed by the intense struggle launched across the country's entire territory by the People's Liberation Army of Namibia [PLAN]. There is a strengthening determination to break the chains of colonial oppression fettering our people and to achieve the fatherland's full liberation despite South Africa's constant military preparations, police terror, reprisals and torture of innocent people and mass killings. Namibians believe that they can achieve freedom just as has been done in the neighboring countries of Angola, Mozambique and later Zimbabwe.

We greeted the New Year with the firm confidence that the People's Liberation Army of Namibia's fighters will continue the struggle against the enemy, the South African occupiers, even though the aggressors are equipped with the latest types of arms and combat hardware. Pretoria is receiving this leathal weaponry from the United States, the FRG, Britain, France, Canada and other NATO countries.

The year 1982 was a difficult one for Namibian patriots. International imperialism, headed by the United States, exerted increasing pressure on SWAPO. The whole world witnessed the overt support that the colonialists and South African occupiers received from Washington even though this also contradicted the well-known UN resolutions on the granting of Namibian independence.

International imperialist reaction tried to step up its actions not only against our country; the world witnessed the imperialist forces' armed aggression in the Near East. Encouraged in its aggressive aspirations by the United States, Israel launched a barbarous war against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples and against the entire Arab world. Tel Aviv's crimes which shook all progressive mankind were made possible by the direct and immediate support received by the Israeli barbarians from the U.S. imperialists. U.S. envoys exerted considerable efforts to remove the Palestinian military subunits from Lebanon. How that ended is well known. The bloody butchery subsequently organized by the Israelis against the remaining defenseless civilians convinced the entire world of the hypocrisy and falseness of U.S. politics.

On more than one occasion last year we witnessed the White House's irresponsible threats against heroic Cuba and the peoples of Nicaragua and El Salvador.... The Reagan administration continued the course of confrontation and dangerous fuelling of world tension. International imperialism's most malicious and aggressive forces grew more active last year.

There was an intensification of the arms race in the United States and of the Pentagon's preparation of deadly new types of weapons including chemical and neutron weapons and MX missiles. At the same time, the Washington administration is attempting to deploy some of its missiles on the territories of a number of European capitalist countries which is undoubtedly helping to fuel tension on the European Continent. But it is obvious to the whole world that the broad popular masses in all countries of the world including Western Europe do not approve of the arms race or confrontation with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. All progressive mankind realizes the mortal danger of such a policy and supports the new Soviet peace initiatives on disarmament.

By arming the racists, the imperialists of the United States and other countries are thus sanctioning the former's implementation of bloody new reprisals against the indigenous inhabitants of Namibia and South Africa. However, our struggle will not be stopped. Because it is a just struggle. It is the war of oppressed Africans for freedom and independence. The people's struggle in Namibia will continue until full victory. The population's firm support for SWAPO's armed struggle guarantees our success.

SWAPO's patriots express profound gratitude and thanks to Lenin's motherland, the Soviet people and the CPSU Central Committee for their concrete and substantial assistance and support for our struggle. We are also grateful to other countries and to various international public organizations which support the Namibian people's national liberation struggle.

The SWAPO leadership has firmly stated to the racist South African regime and the Reagan administration that the delaying of the resolution of the Namibian problem and the attempts to "link" it with the withdrawal of the Cuban forces from Angola are doomed to failure and will not hamper our struggle for Namibia's decolonization.

The Cuban forces' presence in Angola is a matter for two sovereign states -- Angola and Cuba. No one is entitled to interfere in their agreement regarding cooperation and mutual assistance in military and other spheres. In this context the United States would do well to think of its own military bases on other territories such as the FRG, Britain and in other parts of the world. Meanwhile, the U.S. imperialists, having "linked" the Cubans' withdrawal from Angola with the decolonization of Namibia, have comprehensively blocked a peaceful solution of the Namibian problem. Thus all talk to the effect that the United States and other Western countries want progress in the talks on Namibia is nothing but a propaganda stunt aimed at obscuring persisting problems.

I would like to re-emphasize that despite all the racists' maneuvers and tricks, SWAPO will continue the struggle for its motherland's full liberation. Namibia will be free!

PRAVDA CRITICIZES PRESS, REVEALS ECONOMIC 'TURNS'

LD181740 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1636 GMT 18 Jan 83

[Text] Moscow, Jan. 18 (TANJUG) -- PRAVDA, the official organ of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, today (Tuesday) unexpectedly strongly criticized coverage by "the rest of the press" in the USSR since it "does not follow the noticeable turn" in the role of collectives in management of production and fulfilment of plans and obligations.

In the editorial PRAVDA also criticizes the press which "has not realigned" after the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and which does not sufficiently take "care of the latest demands of the party".

What strikes the eye is that today's editorial of the organ of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union publicly and clearly speaks for the first time about the existance of "certain turns" in the Soviet economy, that is, about changes of a systemic character. PRAVDA writes that Soviet worker has a new view on the press, therefore he is no longer only "a consumer of information."

ROMANOV SPEAKS AT LENINGRAD COMMEMORATION

LD182118 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 18 Jan 83

[Excerpt] Four decades ago, on this day, a report echoed around the world that after fierce battles, troops of the Volkhov and Leningrad fronts had joined up, breaking the blockage. Today, a solemn meeting was held devoted to this important event. The opening words were spoken by Comrade Romanov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Leningrad Obkom. He warmly greeted those present in the hall participants in those unforgettable events.

PUBLIC SUPPORTS TOUGH STANCE ON SHIRKERS

LD151434 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 16 Jan 83

[Text] Support for the public movement aimed at toughening the attitude to those who, taking advantage of their constitutional right to work, neglect their duty towards work is growing in the Soviet Union.

There are individuals, people write in their letters to newspapers, who fail to come to work on time and are not conscientious about work, being aware of the fact that they are not threatened by unemployment. Many offer countermeasures. One Moscow worker suggests that bad workers must have their wages reduced. The reduction would be cancelled with a better attitude to work. Careless workers are not numerous, writes a bus driver, but the solution to the problem is important from both a moral and an economic point of view.

The nation has to work hard to implement its development programs. Industrial production must show a 3.2 percent increase this year, and this is no easy task considering that the Soviet Union accounts for one-fifth of the world's industrial produce.

PROCURATOR GENERAL WRITES ON LAW AND ORDER

PM141303 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jan 83 Second Edition p 3

[Article by A. Rekunkov, USSR procurator general, under the rubric "Citizen. Society. Law": "Without Leniency"]

[Text] The Soviet country is confidently following the course indicated by the 26th CPSU Congress. Concern for the Soviet person, for his working and living conditions and his spiritual development, Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, pointed out at the Central Committee's November (1982) plenum, remains the party's most important program guideline. The successful implementation of the plans outlined requires the further strengthening of organization and public discipline.

Every Soviet person can always count on a fair and respectful attitude to himself and on the state's concern. At the same time, it is very important to enhance in every possible way the responsibility of the individual for fulfilling the established rules of behavior in our society. The violation of legality and the norms of communist morality is incompatible with the socialist way of life. It is necessary to intransigently struggle against everything that prevents the working person from living a calm life and fruitfully working and that serves as an obstacle to the full utilization of the advantages of the socialist system.

The Soviet laws, which embrace all aspects of social life are an important means of resolving economic and social tasks. It is precisely the laws that enshrine the Soviet state's concern for the citizen, his rights and freedoms and for the dignity of the human individual. The realization of working people's constitutional rights is one of the main directions in improving our legislation, which is constantly being developed and brought into line with the new tasks facing the country. Strict observance of the USSR Constitution and the laws is the reliable basis for normal life and the further development of society.

The vast majority of citizens conscientiously observe the Soviet laws. However, there are still people who have not developed the habit of observing the norms of the law. Disrupters of production, hooligans, drunkards, speculators, bribetakers and embezzlers profoundly anger Soviet people by their antisocial behavior. In many letters sent to central organs, working people validly point to the need to step up the struggle against violators of labor discipline and of the rules of socialist intercourse and to use the force of law against them in a timely and consistent manner. Citizens are particularly concerned at the unsatisfactory state of public order in certain cities and villages.

The USSR Procuracy recently verified a letter from a group of residents of Gorkiy's Moskovskiy Rayon, which reported the unsatisfactory state of public order and discipline in that rayon. "It is frequently dangerous for us to return home from work in the evenings," the letter stated. "There are attacks on citizens and even on members of the voluntary people's militia. Many hooligans and rowdies go unpunished." The facts were confirmed. The local law-enforcement organs did not wage a vigorous struggle against offense, and measures were not taken following a number of citizens' reports of acts of hooliganism. Rayon Procurator N. Zemskov displayed complacency and failed to properly supervise the work of the militia. A number of militia and Procuracy workers have been punished for violating their official duty.

The party sees Soviet citizens' letters as an important form of the working people's participation in state management and as an effective means of nationwide monitoring of the state of legality. These communications from working people are essentially a mandate to the corresponding state organs to ensure that violators of law and order will inevitably be called to account.

It is necessary to actively and consistently apply effective measures of influence to such persons, to make them reckon with the norms of our intercourse and to prevent any indulgences to recidivists in serving their sentence. For strict responsibility is the necessary condition which, as V.I. Lenin pointed out, turns discipline into actual reality.

Taking public opinion into account and proceeding from the tasks of further strengthening socialist legality and law and order, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the union republic supreme soviet presidiums have adopted a number of decrees aimed at improving legislation on the struggle against offenses and crime.

Changes to legislation are based on a detailed analysis of existing experience in the union republics. In the Georgian SSR, for example, increased liability has been established for thefts committed following entry of residential premises. This measure has justified itself. A similar norm has now appeared in the criminal codes of other union republics. Whereas a theft without aggravating circumstances is punished in accordance with the RSFSR criminal code by imprisonment for up to 2 years, a theft which involves entry of residential accommodation may entail imprisonment for up to 7 years. The stealing of motor vehicles and motorcycles will now be more severely punished.

A number of changes to legislation are aimed at strengthening the protection of socialist property. For example, persons who have committed petty larceny may, in addition to their criminal and administrative liability, be deprived in whole or in part of bonuses on their year's work results or of preferential passes to sanatoriums and rest homes and may be moved further down the waiting list for housing. These measures are applied by the management of enterprises, establishments and organizations by agreement with trade union committees.

Many complaints are elicited from citizens by cases where persons convicted by a court for larceny and mercenary-minded abuses are once again allowed access to material valuables. Henceforth, criminal liability has been introduced for nonobservance of a court sentence depriving a person of the right to hold certain posts or engage in certain activities. This norm applies not only to the swindlers themselves who try to again fix themselves up with a cushy job, but also to those officials who illegally take them on at work.

It would be a profound mistake to reduce the stepping up of the fight against crime to merely establish strict sanctions for committing antisocial actions. Life has long since convincingly proved that the strength of punishment lies not in its severity but in its inevitability. As a penalty for what has been committed, punishment has the purpose of correcting and reeducating convicts and accustoming them to an honest working life. People punished by a court include both hardened criminals and those who have slipped up for the first time. Clearly, measures must also be applied to them with regard to the nature of the crime and the personality of the individual appearing before the court. Strict individualization of responsibility is the chief thing. A number of changes have been made to criminal and correctional labor legislation in order to ensure the consistent implementation of this principle.

There has been a broadening of the possibilities of using measures of punishment which have justified themselves in practice and which are unconnected with incarceration for those who can be corrected without being isolated from society. These include, for example, the reprieve, probation and correctional labor. It is very important, however, that no one should perceive the humaneness of the law as all-forgiveness or the possibility of going unpunished. Therefore, in respect of persons who scorn the trust shown in them and continue to violate public order, the court can rescind the reprieve or probation decision and send the convicted person to serve the term of incarceration previously designated by the sentence.

Persons who commit grave crimes and recidivists must bear responsibility in accordance with all the severity of the Soviet laws, and any indulgence toward hardened criminals is inadmissible. The new norms of the law provide for stricter responsibility for a return to crime and prescribe additional restrictions for recidivists in the application of release on parole and early release on parole from places of detention.

A law lives and acts only when it is carried out and strictly observed and when retribution [otvetstvennost] inevitably and unavoidably awaits the violator.

Special responsibility for the state of public order lies with the procuracy, militia and justice organs and the courts, which are directly called upon to defend legality and the interests of the state and of citizens against any encroachments. Coordination of actions among law-enforcement organs is increasingly being developed. Their concerted efforts and cooperation with other state and public institutions yield positive results. Real progress in strengthening law and order is made where law-enforcement organs set an example of vigorous, assertive work and of an uncompromising attitude toward violators of the law, and when the professional knowledge of their employees is combined with civic courage, justice and crystal-clear honesty.

The law-enforcement organs enjoy deserved respect and authority. However, there are still serious shortcomings in their activity. Preventive work is frequently carried out in isolation from life and from the specific problems of concern to the population. The resources of state organs are not always concentrated on ensuring dependable order in public places and in the streets or on curbing rowdies and burglars. Instances of this sort occur in Chelyabinsk, Donetsk and Kemerovo oblasts and the Mari ASSR. Not all workers of the investigatory apparatus and inquiry organs are conscious of their responsibility for the timely exposure of every crime. Citizens' just complaints are elicited by instances of passiveness -- which are not all that rare -- in suppressing the criminal actions of hooligans, speculators and bribetakers and of the untimely prevention of mismanagement, waste and embezzlement of public property. Instances of the concealment of crimes from being recorded in internal affairs organs have still not been eradicated. Instead of decisively suppressing this fallacious practice, certain procurators have confined themselves to half measures.

The Soviet people, it was emphasized at the 26th party congress, have a right to demand that the work of law-enforcement organs is maximally effective, that every crime is properly investigated and that the guilty person are punished. Drunkards and hooligans, bribetakers and speculators, thieves and parasites and habitual criminals must always feel the force of the law and the inevitability of strict retribution.

V.I. Lenin pointed out that success in the struggle against any forms of antisocial behavior depends to a decisive degree on how the people's mass itself helps. The active life stance of Soviet people and the desire to eliminate from the life of society everything that prevents us from living and working play a decisive role in suppressing any antisocial phenomena. Law-enforcement organ workers are clearly aware that it is only with the help of the population that it is possible to reveal in depth the causes of every crime and successfully combat them. Wide publicity of the work of law-enforcement organs and the forms of their link with the population are constantly being developed.

Propaganda of the Soviet laws, close links with labor collectives, informing citizens of the state of legality and of measures being taken, the courts' investigation of specific cases with visits to enterprises, construction sites, kolkhozes and sovkhozes -- all this is firmly established in everyday practice. Full use must be made of the working people's interest in further strengthening public order and instilling firm discipline.

Violations of law and order decline in collectives where labor discipline is at the proper level and where people are educated in the spirit of a solicitous attitude toward public property.

Unfortunately, such a situation has not been created everywhere. We encounter instances where idleness, absenteeism, drunkenness and petty larceny do not meet with resolute condemnation from surrounding people and where collectives do poor work in reeducating people on probation. Actual impunity brought by such "goodness" at society's expense entails new misfortunes. Instead of combating violations of labor discipline and closing all loopholes for encroachments upon socialist property and for unearned income, certain officials prefer to take the stand of detached observers. Sometimes they write off losses resulting from mismangement, waste and even from direct depredation of public property as production losses.

As shown by a check on reports received, the struggle against poaching and thefts of fish produce was badly conducted in Astrakhan Oblast. Oblast Procurator N. Yegorushkin and the leaders of other law-enforcement organs failed to take the necessary measures to eradicate such phenomena. Proceedings have been instituted against the poachers and plunderers who were brought to light and against the officials who connived at them.

Soviet people who believe that exactingness should be enhanced in labor collectives toward those who discredit the title of citizen of our country by their unworthy behavior, lack of discipline and violation of the norms of the law are profoundly correct.

The strengthening of legality and law and order is a statewide task of the whole people, and it is necessary to resolve it through joint efforts, utilizing for this both the force of the law and the force of public opinion.

MVD DEPUTY CHIEF ON PREVENTING EMBEZZLEMENT

PM171413 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 8 Jan 83 p 2

[Interview With USSR Deputy Minister of Internal Affairs Militia Lieutenant General B.V. Zabotin by unnamed interviewer asking questions suggested by readers; under the rubric "Authoritative Opinion": "Guarding Property" -- date and place of interview not specified]

[Text] [Question] Boris Vasilyevich, more and more attention is being paid lately to combatting the embezzlement of socialist property, but readers and viewers more frequently encountering the image of the criminal investigation worker, the investigating officer, than that of staffers of the combating the embezzlement of socialist property and speculation [BKHSS] service. In your view, why is this and what, in fact, do BKHSS apparatus workers do? This question is asked by S. Dorin from Volgograd and N. Kazantseva from the Karelian ASSR.

[Answer] In fact it must be admitted that the press, literature, cinema and television are still not very fond of the BKHSS service. Why is this? It lacks outward impact.

It is clearly for the same reason that you hardly ever see accountants, auditors or control personnel among the heroes of books, movies or shows. This is a pity. After all, BKHSS service staffers are operational workers just like criminal investigators and possess all the detective's attributes characteristic of that profession' But wherever they turn there is paperwork, since the BKHSS service was specially created to combat crimes committed by officials who work with documents in their daily activity.

In an attempt to avoid punishment, embezzlers and bribetakers muddle accounts, commit forgeries, and write off physical assets without justification on the pretext of spoilage, natural wastage, overstated expenditure and so forth. All of these ruses have to be investigated, and not only the documentation but also the techniques and organization of production have to be studied. You also need to know the forms and methods to which criminals resort. I shall quote some examples.

Tumanyan, chief of the chewing gum section of the Omsk No 8 bread plant, reduced the contents per tube during automatic stamping. With his accomplices' help, he sold the surplus output. The criminal was unmasked and sentenced to 5 years' imprisonment with confiscation of property.

Embezzlers were making up parcels from "surpluses" at the Srednechirchikskiy Rayon consumer services combine in the Uzbek SSR. Criminal proceedings were instituted against shop chief Lin and others.

[Question] It is clear from your description that BKHSS staffers must be trained in diverse spheres. Where are they trained? B. Niyazbayev from the Uzbek SSR is interested in this question in particular.

[Answer] We received graduates from USSR MVD higher and secondary schools and legal VUZes as well as national economic specialists who have undergone the appropriate courses. There is a higher school of the USSR MVD that specializes in training BKHSS workers.

[Question] Our readers are particularly alarmed when young people engage in criminal activity including speculation....

[Answer] Yes, there are quite a few young people among those arrested for buying goods and reselling them at a profit. Speculation is dangerous since it turns people into moneygrubbers for whom, as M.Ye. Saltykov-Shchedrin said, there is nothing sacred in the world except money. There can be no justification for a tolerant attidue toward speculation....

[Question] Boris Vasilyevich, what in your opinion pushes young people into embezzlement and speculation?

[Answer] Without claiming to give an exhaustive reply, I would say: First, the excessively inflated personal demands of some young people, which are not in keeping with their personal labor contribution; second, the notorious philosophy of the "good life," which spawns tricksters.

Speaking of education, one cannot fail to mention self-education. One must "take stock of one's conscience" more often, if I may put it that way.

As for organizational-economic activity, it should be geared toward preventing the conditions which enable embezzlers to build their hornets' nests under the very roof of state enterprises, institutions and organizations.

[Question] In your view, what assistance can the Komsomol give to BKHSS apparatuses? (A question from Ye. Uvarova of Moscow)

[Answer] The Komsomol's tasks in combating mismanagement and struggling for the most strict saving of material resources and for improved standards in the population's services in the trade and public catering spheres were defined by documents of the 26th CPSU and 19th Komsomol Congresses and materials of the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) plenum. There is broad scope here for collaboration between Internal Affairs organs and the Komsomol. As for specific points for the application of joint efforts, I would like to see more active participation by Komsomol organizations in combating speculation, which I have already mentioned, and also petty embezzlement.

"Pilferers" must be countered by organized activity on the part of Komsomol operational detachments of the volunteer militia and the "Komsomol searchlight" system. It is especially important to widely publicize measures of influence so as to shape public opinion better and to create an atmosphere of intolerance, exactingness and principle with regard to all who try to encroach upon the people's property.

[Question] BKHSS organs clearly receive definite assistance from Soviet citizens, letters and warnings from them. How do you assess this assistance? L. Makarevich from Belorussia, N. Toporkov from Yaroslavl and others would like to know about that.

[Answer] Militia activity is inconceivable without it. In recent years Soviet people's intolerance toward all antisocial phenomena has increased perceptibly. This is also shown by an analysis of citizens' letters addressed to USSR MVD subdivisions and by a special study of public opinion of Militia work. In their letters and replies to questionnaires working people raise important problems of the struggle against economic crimes, submit proposals and report specific crimes. This information undergoes detailed study and verification.

Thus it was through Comrade Baranova's statement that criminal proceedings were instituted against the chief and the technical inspector of the Housing and Municipal Service Department of the Staryy Oskol mechanical plant in Belgorod Oblast. With the help of Comrade Shentsov, a war veteran, workers of the Rostov Oblast BKHSS administration exposed instances of the theft of money and the violation of financial and economic discipline by officials of the Novoshakhtinsk No 1249 truck column.

I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to thank all citizens who have helped expose embezzlers of the people's property and remove the conditions promoting particular abuses. The militia's strength lies in its indissoluble link with the people. We always remember that and try to strengthen it.

[Question] What legal measures are being taken to improve the protection of socialist property? (A question from a group of readers in Togliatti).

[Answer] At the end of 1982, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium adopted a number of decrees to improve legislation on combating crime with the aim of further strengthening socialist legality and in the light of many requests from working people.

Criminal responsibility has been reduced and the application of penalties not involving imprisonment has been expanded with regard to those who have committed minor offenses for the first time. At the same time, stiffer penalties will be applied for dangerous crimes such as theft, robbery and robbery with violence and for repeated speculation or speculation committed on a large or particularly large scale or by persons previously convicted of this offense. The maximum term of imprisonment that can be passed by a people's court for speculation with aggravating circumstances has been increased from 7 to 10 years. Criminal responsibility has been stepped up for the petty theft of state and public property. Punishments such as the confiscation of property and fines will be imposed on a broader scale for mercenary crimes.

Of great significance is the adoption of a norm which provides for criminal responsibility for persons who were sentenced by a court to be deprived of the right to hold certain offices or to engage in certain activities but have violated that ban. Criminal responsibility will also be applied to the officials who hired those persons.

The 26th party congress materials stressed that the Soviet people are entitled to demand that every criminal offender receive the punishment he deserves. The legislative acts that have been adopted help to develop the principle of justice.

NATIONAL DIFFERENCES, OFFICIAL POLICY VIEWED

Denial of Russification Charge

PM181005 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 5 Jan 83 p 2

[E. Akhmedyarov article: "Contrary to the Slander"]

[Text] Ashkhabad -- We say with pride that the USSR is our common home, our bulwark and stronghold, and no force in the world is capable of destroying it, whatever malicious fabrications our ill-wishers may resort to.

Problems of the cultural development of the peoples of Central Asia attract constant attention among bourgeois Sovietologists. Of course, this interest is by no means prompted by the desire to present an objective picture and depict the real state of affairs. Its meaning lies in the attempt to belittle our achievements, distort and misinterpret them and show the new, socialist culture as a phenomenon alien to the national spirit and traditions of the peoples of Central Asia and imposed on them by the Russians.

"Russification" in general is a favorite hobbyhorse among falsifiers concerned with questions of interethnic relations in the USSR. They try to prove that many forms of modern art and literature are implanted in the Central Asian republics practically by force, at the cost of the destruction of traditions. For instance, look at the parallels which the Sovietologists draw on the basis of "ethnic community," whereby the few forms of art which are cultivated in backward Eastern countries are "truly Muslim," while all the forms of painting, theater, opera and ballet which are developing rapidly in the Central Asian republics are allegedly superficial and alien to the nature of their indigenous population.

Well, (E. Bekon), who visited our country nearly half a century ago, described as an element of "Russification" even... macaroni, to say nothing of the building of comfortable, substantial housing instead of felt tents and the opening of canteens where "borscht and cutlets predominate instead of traditional dishes."

Such pearls are hardly met with now, but from time to time you encounter something like (E. Bekon's) idea. The notorious "solubility of national traditions" give our uninvited patrons no peace. A characteristic example of such writings is an article by (Z. Fogelfrantz), a correspondent for the West German magazine DER SPIEGEL, on his visit to Ashkhabad.

It is simply amazing how many lies about our capital and its inhabitants this author managed to cram into one small article. Most of the article is devoted to a description of Ashkhabad's "flea market," where the author went with a desire to find "anything national." Looking at the rows of bazaar stalls where national clothing and traditional household utensils are sold, and noting perspicaciously that most people there are representatives of the local population, he draws the profound conclusion: Since in these rows of stalls "only a few Europeans can be seen among the Asians," it follows that "Russians and Turkmens live in the republic, as everywhere in Central Asia, side by side, but at the same time remote from each other." That is what he wrote: "They live side by side," but "remote from each other."!

Moreover the exoticness and national color of the Turkmen capital were in all probability associated in the author's mind with cities from Arabian fairy tales: camels in narrow streets and crowds of beggars outside the mosques. Otherwise it is hard to understand his irritation: The author did not like the fact that the streets in Ashkhabad are wide and asphalted, while the buildings are no different from European ones, and that after the 1948 earthquake the city was rebuilt.

No, (Z. Kogelfranz) found nothing national in Ashkhabad, since in his opinion "in this garrison city in Russia's backwoods there is no sign of the colonial Islamic south... except a monument to Lenin whose pedestal is executed in the style of Bukhara carpets."

Ending his article, (Z. Kogelfranz) apparently realized that his assertions do not quite agree with statements by other anti-Sovietists to the effect that "Russification" and modernization are meeting with "fierce resistance" among Central Asians, who still "hold on to ancient customs and ways to a considerable extent." That is why he did find something "national" in Turkmenia, and it was manifested, according to him, in the character of Ashkhabad cab drivers, who "seek out strangers in order to clean them out, and, if there is any protest, ostentatiously polish their daggers on their trousers." That is what DER SPIEGEL's correspondent argues, quite seriously.

Imperialism -- and it is imperialism which the ideologists of anticommunism serve so devotedly -- would like to see Soviet Central Asia backward and unenlightened, so as to be able to subjugate it more easily to its own influence. That is why the falsifiers are so concerned about preserving "ancient traditions," sighing sorrowfully about the oblivion to which many reactionary religious customs are consigned.

Our writers who have allegedly consigned national literary traditions to oblivion come under particular attack from these "theorists." Distorting and misrepresenting the process of Russian literature's influence on the literatures of the Central Asian peoples, bourgeois Sovietologists assert that this influence was "imposed by the authorities" and has led to a "loss of originality."

The falsity of such assertions is obvious to anyone familiar with the history of Russian-Central Asian literary ties. Incidentally, reference can also be made here to the works of foreign researchers who deal with the question of the classical legacy from from an objective standpoint. The Indian scholar D. Kaushik, for instance, writes that the Soviet Central Asian literatures, while acquiring new forms and content, "incorporate the democratic trends of the early period, extending and enriching them subsequently." "Contacts with Russian culture," he goes on to write, "have made a great contribution to enriching cultural life in Central Asia and have led to the flourishing of the local peoples' intellectual life."

The achievements of the literatures of the USSR's peoples are common knowledge. Whereas in the twenties and thirties, as (Ya. Myuller-Udeys) writes, "there was only one answer to the question of mutual influence: Russian literature had an influence...but there could be no question of any influence on Russian literature," now "Russian literature looks with great curiosity at what is happening around it."

But as we see, the ideologists of imperialism pretend not to hear these sober, objective voices, just as they will not reckon with the real state of affairs.

Ignoring the fundamental characteristics of the interaction of cultures under socialism on the basis of proletarian internationalism, fraternal cooperation and mutual assistance, they try to foist on their readers the thesis of the "suppression" of the literatures of the USSR's non-Russian peoples and, of course, some kind of local "resistance" to this imaginary process.

A writer need only depict in his work some national custom, such as respect for elders or a people's festival, and the falsifiers start shouting about yet another manifestation of the rapid growth of nationalism among the Central Asian intelligentsia. If a Turkmen poet creates a work about his native village and uses the word "motherland" in relation to it, they will assert in all seriousness that another dissident has emerged and that his poetry is nothing less than a "covert form of protest" against the Russians.

Woe betide the writer who touches on the question of national relations in the region in his work, a newspaper article or an interview. Take, for instance, the remarks of a certain (A. Prosyk). She quotes from an article in a Turkmen journal about Turkmen-Uzbek literary ties and the similarity of the two fraternal peoples' artistic traditions. (A. Prosyk) sees this as a manifestation of fervent anti-Sovietism and pan-Turanianism and writes profoundly: "It seems probable that the assurances of close kinship, fraternity and similarity...go beyond the simple idea of the friendship of peoples....'"

The ideologists of imperialism have been talking about "upshoots of interethnic discord" since the earliest years of the establishment of Soviet power in Central Asia. In their view the principles of proletarian internationalism are alien to the Soviet East, which has allegedly been for 6 decades now an arena of fierce, albeit concealed, struggle between the peoples, between the local population and the "newcomers."

These gentlemen do not resort to such laughable insinuations just for the fun of it. They need these comforting lies in order somehow to justify the tyranny and violence perpetrated in capitalist countries in relation to small peoples: Look, they say, things are even worse in the Soviet Union. In the "crusade" against our country anything goes: the vilest lies, slander, provocations and juggling with facts.

R. Pipes, the well-known American Sovietologist, stated, without giving it much thought, that "communist ideology has lost all its magnetism" in Central Asia. He also loves all kinds of parallels and analogies which, in his opinion, should convince readers of the similarity between interethnic relations in capitalist and socialist societies: "The fact that English was for a long time the language of the Indian intelligentsia and became the official language of the Indian Parliament after independence did not and does not indicate rapprochement between the British and the Indians." Thus Britain's colonial policy is equated with the Soviet state's nationalities policy, which is based on the principles of proletarian internationalism, mutual friendship and cooperation.

The motif of the mythical confrontation between the Soviet East and Russia permeates many works by Sovietologists concerned with questions of history and literature. Thus, for instance, the aforementioned (A. Prosyk) notes the increase in the number of historical novels and stories in the Central Asian literatures and the increased work of societies for the protection of cultural monuments. She cites many examples indicating the interest of the Central Asian peoples in their past, thereby contradicting those of her colleagues who talk about the "oblivion of the cultural heritage in Central Asia."

But after demonstrating the tremendous attention and concern devoted to the cultural heritage in our country, (A. Prosyk) draws a stunning conclusion: It seems that all this is connected with "alienation" from the Russians. "The interest in the past which has recently become widespread among the Central Asian nationalities," she writes, "must promote divergence between them and the newcomers.... They are...drawing away from the Russians and other Soviet nationalties. Thus interest in the past can be regarded as a factor in the direction of weakening stabilization."

The CPSU Central Committee resolution "On the 60th Anniversary of the USSR's Formation" says:

"The peoples of the Soviet Union have seen from their own experience that rallying in a single alliance augments their forces and accelerates socioeconomic development. We are rightly proud that in common formation with the working people of all the country's nations, the peoples of the former national backwaters, once doomed to centuries of backwardness, have stepped confidently into the socialist future, bypassing capitalism, and have attained the heights of social progress.

In the joint struggle for a new, just world a great fraternity of working people and a sense of being a single family have emerged and the indestructible Leninist friendship of the peoples has become established -- and these are the inexhaustible sources of constructive creativity among the masses."

Contrary to the malicious fabrications of ill-wishers, the peoples of the USSR, including the peoples of Central Asia, cherish our indestructible unity. We say with pride: The USSR is our common home, our bulwark and stronghold, and no force in the world is capable of destroying it!

Solomentsev Interview

PM180915 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 29 Dec 82 p 2

[Special correspondents Yuriy Zarechkin and Yuriy Poroykov interview with M.S. Solomentsev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers: "'Setting an Example of a Firm Alliance....'" -- date and place not specified]

[Excerpt] [Question] National differences and peculiarities -- cultural, daily living, ethnic, linguistic and sociopsychological -- are sometimes reflected differently in people's awareness and behavior. Some of them, reacting very painfully to the disappearance of particular obviously outdated traditions and customs of their people, persistently militate for their preservation. They seem particularly valuable to them despite being on the sidelines....

[Answer] ...Is the view from the sidelines clearer? That is not out of the question. But the main thing here, in my view, is still to reply to anyone worried about the possible loss of national features: The best national achievements, our experience attests, do not disappear without a trace but unfailingly become the common possession of the Soviet people and all mankind, and I am sure they will remain for the people of the future communist society. Incidentally, a similar thought, backed up by facts, was expressed quite fully in previous talks with LITERATURNAYA GAZETA correspondents when they discussed the internationalization and integration of cultures.

Of course, one must be objective to see this. Otherwise it is hard to understand the correlation between specific national features and natural integration processes.

Of course, we cannot be protected against someone being temporarily prey to national prejudices and obsolete ideas. Relapses by individuals are possible, as we know. But that does not mean we should overlook such instances. Revealing and making a correct assessment of them is an important task for our literature. It must be borne in mind, Comrade Andropov said at the ceremonial session, that the spiritual heritage, traditions and daily life of each nation may contain not only good but also bad, outdated elements. We must not keep these bad elements but rid ourselves of everything which has become obsolete and runs counter to the norms of Soviet communal living, socialist morality and our communist ideals.

[Question] Our foes abroad are not abandoning their attempts to impose on Soviet people the bourgeois interpretation of national self-awareness and sovereignty and try by every means to discredit the union of socialist nations and generate hostility and distrust among the USSR peoples, making use, in paticular, of the religious prejudices and traditions which still persist.

[Answer] Of course, they cannot dictate the path along which the Soviet nations and ethnic groups develop. Is it any surprise that the anticommunists absolutely refuse to understand the irreversibility of the process of the internationalization of the socialist way of life.

What lies behind this process has long been a basic fact to us. After all, the new principles governing mutual relations among the fraternal republics and fraternal peoples have become an organic part of our daily lives, like air or water. They are imbibed by the Soviet person from the cradle, so to speak. This is enshrined by our Constitution and guaranteed by it.

Take Yakutia or Bashkiria, Dagestan or Tataria -- everywhere the citizens living there are equally assured of all constitutional rights in economic, sociopolitical and cultural life, not to mention the opportunity to use their native language. Here social origin, race, nationality or religious attitude are of no significance.... Yes, we know that religious prejudices persist in some people. We are doing everything to help believers rid themselves of these prejudices.

Religious and national narrow-mindedness are sometimes akin, and that is why we frequently view them in conjunction. If national introversion is gradually vanishing, this has a beneficial effect on the reduction of the vitality of religion.... Yet the main trend in the development of nations was accurately assessed by Marx long ago. "The old local and national narrow-mindedness...is being replaced by nations' all-around ties and all-around dependence on each other.... National bias and introversion are becoming increasingly impossible...."

[Question] However, some people sometimes view a trend as some completely formed reality. Or, to be more precise, they draw no distinction between what will be and what exists today in incomplete form. One of our readers, a Muscovite, on the basis of the trends he has noted toward the rapprochement of Soviet Nations and ethnic groups, strenuously tried to prove to the newspaper that it was time to remove the passport entry relating to the national origin of a USSR citizen and also to remove this entry in all other documents. He kept to his view despite our efforts to prove that such reforms would be premature. Since the concept of the "Soviet people" exists, he insisted, that means that there is no need to emphasize national separateness.

[Answer] A simple and at the same time complex question. To a certain extent it is answered by what I said earlier about the dialectics of the national and the international. I want to add that the speculative hypothesis of what you might call superaccelerated rapprochement of nations and ethnic groups can be explained purely psychologically. Some people really do already feel themselves to be above the nation in its former, traditional sense. It is one thing when the Bashkir poet Mustay Karim proclaims: "I am not a Russian [Russkiy] but a citizen of Russia [rossiyanin]," meaning that he belongs to the Bashkir people and to the federation uniting the Russians and their brothers. But it is another when the result is the rejection of any membership of national formations which have long existed in real life.

The artificiality and prematurity of abolishing mentions of national origin are obvious. In his report at the ceremonial session devoted to the 60th anniversary of the USSR's formation Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov mentioned Lenin's words that our ultimate goal "is not only the nations' rapprochement but their merging." And he added: "The party is well aware that the path to this goal is a long one. Here we must under no circumstances charge ahead just as we must not allow urgent processes to be held back."

I repeat again, it is obviously premature to raise such questions. Other, more local but in no way less important questions are next in line. For instance, in connection with the development of industry the numbers of the nonindigenous population in an autonomous republic increases -- and a mass of questions arises. Many cares emerge concerning the creation of schools, the publication of textbooks in the language of these nationalities and the development of cultural and art institutions. The structure of the administrative organs: It too undergoes changes....

Briefly, in all this activity we strictly follow the line of the 26th party congress: We oppose trends aimed at the artificial erasure of national features and equally we regard their artificial exaggeration as intolerable.

Algerian Writer

PM141421 [Editorial Report] Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian on 29 December 1982 publishes on pages 9 and 14 a 1,600-word interview by Viktor Stoppi with Algerian writer Henri Alleg under the heading "On the Truth of History and the Joy of Life." Alleg, who is now "working on a book about how the nationalities question has been resolved in the Soviet Union," claims that "it is characteristic that it is the Central Asian republics which have now been chosen as the target for anti-Soviet slander and falsification" because of their "powerful upsurge" in postwar years, and goes on to contrast the Soviet attitude toward the republics with the relationship between Western powers and their former colonies and the United States and the Latin American states.

Alleg goes on to deny that Soviet ethnic minorities are being "Russified" and that the Russians will be overwhelmed by the Central Asian peoples as a result of the latter's higher birth rate. Those who make these allegations "pretend not to know that in the USSR there is no oppression, that the Russian people deliberately accepted privations and sacrifices and went without a great deal to support other peoples."

Finally Alleg comments on bourgeois attempts to turn Islam into "a means of setting the peoples of Soviet Central Asia against the 'godless men from the CPSU.'" Soviet Muslims, he asserts, are "primarily sincere Soviet patriots with great pride in their motherland. Yes, they believe in God. But they do not give their faith a narrow, obscurantist sense."

IZVESTIYA REVIEWS VOLUME 9 OF BREZHNEV BOOK

PM111243 IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Dec 82 Morning Edition p 2

[Unattributed book review: "For the Sake of Great Ideals"]

[Text] All the varied, titanic activity of our party and the Soviet state is built on the powerful foundation of Marxism-Leninism. Creatively developing Marxist-Leninist theory, generalizing the experience accumulated and responding with sensitivity to the requirements of the time, the CPSU is elaborating a scientifically substantiated course in the sphere of domestic and foreign policy and is seeking its unswerving implementation. The documents of party congresses and of CPSU Central Committee plenums and the works by party and state leaders contain an in-depth, comprehensive analysis of the most urgent theoretorical and practical problems of communist building and the world revolutionary process.

Leonid Ilich Brezhnev made an outstanding contribution to the elaboration and consistent implementation of the party's and state's course permeated by constant concern for the working man, the improvement of the people's welfare and the consolidation of peace on our planet. "Our party's principles struggle in defense of Marxism-Leninism and its elaboration of the theory of developed socialism and ways of resolving the most urgent tasks of communist building are linked with Leonid Ilich's name," Comrade Yu.V. Andropov has noted.

The creative nature of the policy of the CPSU and Soviet state and its content and goals at the stage of mature socialism are profoundly revealed in the multivolume publication of the works of L.I. Brezhnev, "Following Lenin's Course." The ninth volume (footnote: L.I. Brezhnev. Following Lenin's Course. Speeches, greetings, articles, reminiscences. Ninth volume, Moscow Political Literature Publishing House 1982) was published recently and includes works relating to the period from March 1981 through June 1982.

The book records the imposing panorama of the inspired labor of Soviet people persistently and purposefully implementing the historic plans of the 26th CPSU Congress. It analyzes comprehensively many important questions of the country's economic and social progress, the consolidation of socialist democracy and statehood and the improvement of the Soviet way of life.

Since the 26th CPSU Congress, much has been done to implement the main task of the 11th 5-Year Plan: the steady improvement of the people's material and cultural living standard on the basis of enhancing the efficiency of all social production, increasing labor productivity and boosting Soviet people's social and labor activeness. This period has been steeped in major political events. The CPSU Central Committee November (1981) and May (1982) plenums and the speeches delivered at them by L.I. Brezhnev contain an in-depth, principled analysis of the state of affairs on the main avenues of the country's socioeconomic development and define ways and means of resolving the tasks which require the maximum concentration of the efforts of the party and people.

Every stage in our society's development sets its own tasks, fills them with specific new content and requires new approaches toward their solution. In recent years there have been changes in the dimensions of the national economy, the nature of labor, and key avenues of economic building. Transferring the economy to an intensive growth footing and making it truly economical -- that is now the common goal of the party and state organs, the economic apparatus, public organizations and labor collectives. This idea pervades all the items in the book. That is why it raises so pointedly and in so principled a manner questions of the struggle for the rational, economical utilization of material resources and the struggle against any losses. We lose an immoderately large amount of output because we have still not learned to properly protect the people's wealth. We lose it because of an individual's negligence in production, because of blunders on the part of designers, because particular enterprise leaders lack a state approach, and because of the poor organization of shipments and the storage of output. Losses do not arise of their own accord; there are specific culprits. We lack vigor in making these culprits answerable. On the other hand we still give inadequate encouragement to those who know how to make rational use of raw material, fuel and energy and to save every kopek belonging to the state.... It is not for nothing that our economy is called the national economy. Its entire development is subordinated to the nation's welfare. It is in our power to prevent any losses if we rouse all our party, soviet, trade union and Komsomol organizations and the entire people to tackle the matter. The active struggle against losses by all working people is a good form of the masses' participation in the management of society's affairs.

Our party and state link concern for the improvement of the working people's lives inseparably with concern for the development of the economy. It is impossible to ensure an improvement in prosperity without the proper development of production, and at the same time the better our labor and living conditions are, the more successfully production development itself will proceed. This is an axiom of the socialist way of life. The more mature our society becomes, the more attention we can and must pay to the working people's daily needs -- housing, nutrition, the services sphere, health and education -- and to everything which determines man's well-being and mood.

It is entirely natural that questions connected with the elaboration and implementation of the USSR Food Program occupy a very important place in the anthology.

The book shows that the Food Program is a fundamentally new step in the system of our planning and the management of the socialist economy. It incorporates an integral, comprehensive approach toward the solution of the food problem. A very important feature of this approach is to link and pool the work of both agriculture and the sectors of industry, transport and trade which serve it and to subordinate their entire activity to the overall end goal -- the production of high-quality foodstuffs and their delivery to the consumer.

Measures for the social restructuring of the countryside are an integral part of the Food Program. It is planned to construct well-appointed housing, mainly of the homestead type with outbuildings for personal subsidiary plots. The construction of schools, children's preschool institutions and clubs will be expanded. Medical, trade and consumer services for the rural population will be improved.

The book makes it possible to draw the irrefutable conclusion that in the land of the soviets everything exists for successful work: highly developed production forces, the sociopolitical and moral unity of our society, a clear-cut strategy of advance incorporated in the party's decisions. The task is to reach every working person, to make the requirements of the party's economic policy accessible and comprehensible to him and to show convincingly that it is this policy which accords with his vital interests and that therefore the duty of each person is to promote its total success by his initiative and creative questing....

A considerable place in the anthology is occupied by items linked with the constantly growing role of the soviets in all spheres of our society's life. After all it is the soviets which, in accordance with the Constitution, embody the unity of territorial and sectorial administration. On the other hand the soviets are responsible for the development of production and for the improvement of the quality of services for people. The further development of our socialist society presupposes the increasingly full, increasingly comprehensive solution of these problems.

The soviets today mean over 50,000 elected organs, over 2 million deputies and tens of millions of activists. These figures themselves attest to the mighty fund of creativity the soviets possess.

Taking an active part in the fulfillment of the party decisions, every link of the soviets must operate within the framework of its powers. For the local organs of power this means primarily improving services for people, implementing the Food Program, increasing the production of consumer goods and fulfilling plans for the construction of housing, schools, hospitals and kindergartens. On all these questions the soviets and their ispolkoms must act as stern and demanding proprietors making full use of their coordinating and control functions.

The soviets' role is particularly great in implementing the Food Program. Their efforts must be aimed at ensuring the buildup of agricultural production output and the improvement of the standard of the work of every kolkhoz and sovkhoz in fulfilling the plan targets. Control over the construction and timely commissioning of the agroindustrial complex enterprises requires close attention. An important and very promising matter is assistance in developing personal subsidiary plots, horticultural collectives and plant and factory subsidiary farms. The soviets are called on to erect a firm barrier against any unproductive losses -- squandering agricultural land, fertilizers and herbicides and the spoilage of the output obtained.

The strenth of soviet power lies in its very close link with the people's masses. Relying on their initiative and activeness, it organizes and directs the people's efforts into a single channel. This is a guarantee of our successes, a guarantee of the consolidation and development of the socialist state system.

The works published in the ninth volume contain important propositions devoted to an analysis of Lenin's nationalities policy and convincingly show its great achievements.

The fraternal unity of the working people of all nationalities does not happen of its own accord. Its consolidation and development require great, painstaking work. After all, the friendship of our country's peoples is manifested and should be manifested primarily in specific deeds, in each nation's concern for nationwide interests, and in the entire people's concern for each nation's all-around flowering. That is the gist of the nationalities policy of our party and the soviet authorities at the present stage.

Items revealing the persistent and consistent activity of the CPSU and Soviet state in implementing the foreign policy program of the 26th party congress -- the Peace Program for the Eighties -- are widely represented in the book.

The Soviet Union has advocated and will continue to advocate the elimination of the crisis and hotbeds of military conflicts which the imperialists create and the halting of declared and undeclared wars. The international situation may be worse or better but it is very important not to leave the correct path. It is necessary to work persistently to quell the pitch of tension, preserve detente and ensure its further development.

Our designs are pure and noble, L.I. Brezhnev noted. Our might is great. But we will never use it in such a way as to harm the peoples. It serves and will continue to serve the cause of peace.

Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's life was cut short when his thoughts and efforts were directed toward resolving the very large-scale tasks of the country's economic, social and cultural development. The CPSU Central Committee November (1982) plenums confirmed most definitely that our party and state see their paramount duty in implementing these tasks and consistently pursuing the domestic and foreign policy course elaborated by the 24th through 26th CPSU Congresses.

"The days during which we bade farewell to Leonid Ilich Brezhnev," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov noted in his speech at the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) plenum, "showed the whole world again that our Communist Party and the Soviet people are indivisible and that they live by a single aspiration -- to march firmly and unswervingly along Lenin's path."

The ninth volume of L.I. Brezhnev's works "Following Lenin's Course" was published on the eve of a noteworthy date for the multinational Soviet people -- the 60th anniversary of the USSR's formation. Preparing to greet this notable date with important and new successes in labor and all spheres of social life, Soviet people at the same time thoughtfully survey the path the country has traveled in order to assess the scales of our achievements and ponder the very rich experience of communist building accumulated by the people. The book helps us to ascertain even more deeply and fully the significance of the historical processes of social development and the great constructive force of the CPSU's Leninist course.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA ON EFFECT OF RUMOR, GOSSIP

PM170851 [Editorial Report] Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian on 28 December 1982 in its Second Edition publishes on page 2 under the rubric "Frank Discussion" a 2,000-word S. Stepunina article entitled "Rumors, Rumors...." It deals with the harmfulness of rumor-mongering and emphasizes the need to stop rumors before they get out of hand. The writer cites the example of a rumor she heard that half of the city of Saratov had been demolished by a terrible explosion. In that case the rumors became so widespread that the newspaper deemed it necessary to report the actual facts, which were that chemicals had exploded in a basement, killing an institute director in his office in the same building. The writer then criticizes people who spread malicious gossip about other people, and concludes that "the businesslike rhythm which the party today exhorts us all to maintain is incompatible with idle talk and with time and effort spent suppressing rumors."

ECONOMISTS VIEW SVERDLOVSK OBLAST'S POTENTIAL

PM181059 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 8 Jan 83 p 2

[Correspondent V. Denisov report: "Forecast for the North"]

[Text] Sverdlovsk Oblast -- Research by a group of scientists from the USSR Academy of Sciences Ural Scientific Center's Institute of Economics is devoted to the north of Sverdlovsk Oblast. It has been established that the rich potential of the north of Sverdlovsk Oblast is not yet being fully utilized. The industrial development tempo is slower here than in the southern part of the oblast, and social and cultural and consumer service problems are felt more acutely.

These conclusions are reflected in a scientific report, just prepared, comprising part of a large collective work whose aim is to determine the optimum scheme for siting and developing the production forces of the Ural economic region through the end of this century. In the scientists' opinion the northern cities and rayons could be developed more rapidly. In particular, large stocks of copper, manganese and iron ores and raw material for the production of construction materials are concentrated here. In addition northern cities are advantageously sited between the developed regions of the central and western Urals close to Tyuman Oblast's oil and gas. In brief, there is every prerequisite for forming a new, powerful mining industry complex in the near future. The scientific studies place special emphasis on a unified approach toward the development of the territory and on the consolidation of the heavy industry sectors, particularly ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy.

PRAVDA CRITICIZES FERROUS METALLURGY MINISTRY

PM181625 [Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 28 December 1982 in its Second Edition publishes on page 2 under the heading "We Are Waiting for Metal" a 500-word letter to I.P. Kazanets, USSR minister of ferrous metallurgy, from a group of workers at the Stroydetal-70 trust, Sverdlovsk Oblast, complaining that the nondelivery of metal from the West Siberian and Chelyabinsk metallurgical plants has prevented them from fulfilling the plan for the fourth quarter. "We do not understand, Ivan Pavlovich, why the metallurgical workers treat the fulfillment of the state plan and their delivery commitments so irresponsibly," the letter says, appealing to the minister and the metallurgical workers themselves to rectify matters and improve labor and manufacturing discipline.

The letter is followed by a comment from the PRAVDA editorial office stating:

"In publishing the Sverdlovsk workers' letter the editorial office considered the fact that other labor collectives are also making serious complaints about the metallurgical workers. Some of those in arrears were named on 4 October in a selection of items on the construction of the Urengoy-Uzhgorod gas pipeline. Unfortunately, the USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy has still not reacted to readers' alarm signals or to reports from the worker correspondent post about shortcomings in the work of the Krivorozhstal plant. The Dneprodzerzhinsk, Kommunarsk and other metallurgical plants in southern Ukraine are also failing to meet output deliveries. This is disrupting the work of enterprises in many sectors, which cannot be tolerated any further."

BRIEFS

AUTOMATIC RAILWAY STATIONS -- Work is underway in Kashka-Darya Oblast in Uzbekistan to introduce automation in the oblast's railway stations. Most of the railway stations in the oblast will operate automatically by the end of the current 5-year development plan period. [Tashkent Domestic Service in Uzbek 1300 GMT 16 Jan 83 GF]

EIGHT COSMOS-SERIES SATELLITES LAUNCHED 19 JAN

LD191029 Moscow TASS in English 1021 GMT 19 Jan 83

[Text] Moscow January 19 TASS -- The Soviet Union today launched eight artificial earth satellites Cosmos-1429, Cosmos-1430, Cosmos-1431, Cosmos-1432, Cosmos-1433, Cosmos-1434, Cosmos-1435, and Cosmos-1436. The eight satellites were put into orbit by a single booster rocket.

The satellites carry scientific equipment for continuing the study of outer space.

All the eight satellites are moving on orbits close to the estimated ones with the following initial parameters: period of revolution -- 115.3 minutes, maximum distance from the earth's surface -- 1,513 kilometers, minimum -- 1,449 kilometers, inclination of the orbit -- 74 degrees.

The equipment is working normally.

PRAVDA PUBLISHES ARTICLE ON COSMOS-1402

PM181003 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jan 83 Second Edition p 3

["Interview [as published] with Academician O. Belotserkovskiy, rector of the Moscow Physicotechnical Institute" under the rubric "Cosmos-1402: Our Commentary": "With a Nuclear Power Unit" -- date and place not specified]

[Text] Space vehicles can use various types of power sources, such as solar batteries, fuel elements, chemical batteries and nuclear systems. The use of a particular power source is determined by the particular features of the vehicle and technical considerations. A series of advantages of nuclear power sources -- high power capacity, long life, compact size and ability to function independently of solar radiation -- have given rise to the preference for their use in providing a power supply for certain space vehicles.

Two types of nuclear power sources can be used in outer space -- nuclear reactors and radioisotope generators. In a nuclear reactor thermal energy is obtained through a controlled uranium-235 fission reaction and is converted into other forms of energy -- electricity, for instance.

As is the case with the use of nuclear power in installations on the ground (nuclear power stations, research reactors and so forth) and shipboard reactors, nuclear power sources for use in space require the adoption of appropriate design and operational measures to ensure the safety of man and the environment from ionizing radiation and possible radioactive contamination both in normal conditions and in the conditions of an accident.

The safety of reactor systems on space vehicles is in no doubt provided such systems are started up and used in high orbits where the ballistic lifetime -- that is, the time before penetration of the dense strata of the atmosphere -- is sufficient for the decay of radioactive products to a safe level after the fulfillment of the prescribed program. This guarantees that on the eventual return to earth of the reactor's fission products and its structural components, the dose levels will in no circumstances exceed the safe limits recommended by the International Commission on Radiological Protection.

If power units with nuclear reactors are intended for use in low orbits, where the duration of satellites' existence is insufficient for the decay of radioactive materials to an acceptable level, safety is ensured by transferring the nuclear power unit to an orbit of prolonged duration (with an orbit higher than 800 km, the duration exceeds 300 years), where, basically, the radioactive materials are buried after the satellite

has fulfilled its program. Naturally, there can be factors preventing the transfer to a high orbit from occurring, and therefore additional measures are envisaged in order to guarantee safety from radiation. One of the most effective measures is the dispersal (division into small particles) of the radioactive material from the nuclear reactor to such an extent that in the event of particles of material falling to earth, the radiological situation would not be dangerous to people or the environment.

As is known, when space vehicles enter the dense strata of the atmosphere they burn up to a considerable extent because of aerodynamic braking. This fact can be used to ensure the destruction and safe dispersal of the radioactive materials from a nuclear reactor by elaborating special technical measures.

Questions connected with the use of nuclear power sources in outer space have been discussed at the United Nations, in the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee on the use of outer space for peaceful purposes. The subcommittee concluded that the safe use of nuclear power sources in outer space is possible on condition that the aforementioned safety measures are fulfilled.

At present nuclear power sources involving both isotopes and nuclear reactors are used in outer space.

The Soviet Union has developed and is using power units with nuclear reactors.

On 30 August 1982 the Soviet Union launched its latest artificial earth satellite, Cosmos-1402, with a nuclear power unit on board.

The power unit incorporates a small nuclear reactor whose fuel core consists of heat-releasing elements made of uranium enriched with uranium-235. The fuel core is encased in a beryllium reflector, which houses control elements ensuring the control of the reactor and its shutdown after the end of operation.

On 28 December 1982 the satellite Cosmos-1402, which is equipped with a safety system according to international recommendations, completed its work program and ceased active existence on a command from earth. On a command from earth, a system was activated which shut off the reactor and divided the satellite into three fragments, one of which burned up on 30 December on its entry into dense strata of the atmosphere. The two remaining fragments are the main part of the satellite's structure and the reactor fuel core, which is separate. According to preliminary calculations the main part of the satellite's structure will enter the dense strata of the atmosphere in the last few days of January, and the fuel core in mid-February this year. The withdrawal of the fuel core with its radioactive fission products from the reactor ensures guaranteed conditions for it to burn up in the dense strata of the atmosphere and for the materials to be dispersed into finely divided particles. Should these particles fall out, the radiological situation will be within the limits recommended by the International Commission on Radiological Protection.

In the United States radioisotope power units predominate in space vehicles, although in 1965 the United States launched a satellite with a reactor unit. Radioisotope power sources use energy from the radioactive decay of isotopes of the plutonium-238 type to obtain heat, which is then converted into electricity. Several space vehicles using radioisotope generators manufactured in the United States are currently in operation in space.